

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, December 14, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Earle Wilfley, pastor of the Vermont Avenue Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee this morning for the path-way of life that sometimes seems hard, but which, if we walk in it aright, becomes a path of pleasantness and peace. So we ask Thee for strength, O God, to do that which is pleasing in Thy sight and which commends itself to the sense of right of all men. We would remember before Thee this morning especially, our Father, our soldier heroes who are returning in constantly increasing numbers from the battle front, some of them broken and maimed in body, but, we thank Thee, undaunted in spirit. Bring them home, O God, with honor and with the plaudits and praise of a grateful Nation and to the loving devotion of those to whom they are so dear.

Wilt Thou bless the session of this House to-day and make us worthy of Thy blessing? For Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, December 10, 1918.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have this day forwarded to the governor of Virginia my resignation as a member of the House of Representatives from the Sixth Virginia district, to take effect on Monday, December 16.

Sincerely, yours,

CARTER GLASS.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 13261. An act providing for the transportation from the District of Columbia of governmental employees whose services no longer are required.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER. At the memorial service for Senator TILLMAN to-morrow the Chair appoints the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] to act as Speaker pro tempore.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado in the chair.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-two Members present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Cox	Fess	Hayes
Ashbrook	Crisp	Flynn	Heaton
Bacharach	Curry, Cal.	Francis	Heintz
Benson	Dale, N. Y.	French	Helm
Blackmon	Dale, Vt.	Fuller, Mass.	Hensley
Blanton	Davey	Gallivan	Hicks
Borland	Davis	Gandy	Hood
Bowers	Decker	Garland	Howard
Brand	Delaney	Glass	Hull, Iowa
Britten	Denton	Good	Humphreys
Brodbeck	Dewalt	Gould	Hutchinson
Brumbaugh	Dies	Graham, Pa.	Jacoway
Caldwell	Dilling	Gray, N. J.	Johnson, S. Dak.
Carlin	Drane	Griest	Johnson, Wash.
Carter, Mass.	Dunn	Griffin	Kahn
Carter, Okla.	Eagan	Hadley	Keating
Clark, Fla.	Eagle	Hamilton, N. Y.	Kelly, Pa.
Coady	Edmonds	Harrison, Miss.	Key, Ohio
Collier	Emerson	Haugen	Klenns, Pa.
Connelly, Kans.	Estopinal	Hayden	Knutson
Cooper, Ohio	Ferris		Kreider
Costello			Lampert

Larsen	Nelson, J. M.	Sanders, La.	Thomas
Linthicum	Nicholls, S. C.	Schall	Tinkham
Little	Nolan	Scott, Pa.	Van Dyke
Littlepage	Oliver, Ala.	Scully	Vare
Lobeck	O'Shaunessy	Shackelford	Vestal
London	Park	Sherley	Voigt
Lunn	Powers	Shouse	Waldow
McAndrews	Price	Siegel	Watson, Pa.
McArthur	Ragsdale	Smith, C. R.	White, Ohio
McClintic	Rainey, J. W.	Smith, T. F.	Wilson, Ill.
McLaughlin, Pa.	Reavis	Stedman	Wilson, Tex.
Maher	Riordan	Steele	Winslow
Mason	Roberts	Sterling	Woods, Iowa
Mays	Rodenberg	Stiness	Woodyard
Moore, Pa.	Rowe	Strong	Zihlman
Morin	Rowland	Sullivan	
Mudd	Russell	Swift	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 13308, the Post Office appropriation bill, finding itself without a quorum, had caused the roll to be called, when 280 Members responded to their names, and he reported a list of the absentees.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent general debate was limited to six hours, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] and three hours by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON]. The gentleman from Minnesota has used 40 minutes. The gentleman from Tennessee has not occupied any time. He is now recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, if I am permitted, I will attempt to discuss some of the facts connected with the bill and some of its main features as they may appear to me. To that end, inasmuch as I have no manuscript or notes or orderly line of discussion, I ask the close attention of the House. A little later on I shall discuss other matters of national importance while I have the floor. The Post Office Department had a very small beginning. I believe the sum of about \$17,000 was expended the first fiscal year for the service, to the very great disgust and chagrin of the people and statesmen of that day. We have lived to see this bill, under the development of the department, reach the enormous sum of three hundred and sixty odd millions of money. The present bill carries \$359,000,000 in round numbers. And yet, with the extension of this service all over the United States, with its extension to thirty odd nations by convention, carrying the mail to the four quarters of the earth, this great department of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, secured a revenue of some \$19,000,000 surplus, after all expenses of the department were paid, to be turned into the National Treasury to meet general expenses. This is greatly to the credit of Postmaster General Burleson and his postal forces. In the development of a great business institution like this, affecting each and every citizen of the country, the Congress should be liberal and encourage progressive measures in the service for the benefit of the people.

I recollect within my service on the committee that the bill carried only \$89,000,000 with a deficit of \$17,000,000. That was the beginning of the rural free delivery, a wise and valuable service, that is not yet a paying service, but a service on which we lose much. The people are entitled to the best possible mail service. The employees of the Government are entitled to just and adequate compensation for this service. Therefore the increase in the pay of the low-salaried mail clerks, carriers, and others has been provided for in this measure. As we have in the past extended and improved the service and increased moderately the salaries of employees we have benefited the public and made the department self-sustaining as a whole and produced a surplus revenue. Let us move forward to the full development of this splendid service.

The Post Office Department is one of very ample power. It carries the mails by footmen, by rail, by boat, by ships, by motor vehicles, horse-drawn vehicles, by aeroplanes, and we carry it by truck from the city to the country. We are developing this great system all along the line. Of necessity there must be experiments, experiments for a long period that will not pay, and yet are of such value and service to the country that we ultimately resolve them into the fixed system of administration.

Take the rural free delivery—is there any man in this House that would want the rural delivery to cease with its 45,000 routes and carriers carrying the mail to the people of the whole country? Yet that service lacks 20 odd millions of money to pay its way.

We have attempted to secure an increase in the rates of second-class matter. We are carrying the second-class matter of the United States at a loss of more than \$60,000,000 after the recoupment of \$20,000,000 under the last revenue measure, yet we must carry second-class matter, the papers of the country.

We have another service, the aeroplane service. It is new, it is untried, and it is experimental. It may prove of great benefit and advantage and it may not. The experiment, I am advised, as shown by the report of the Postmaster General, so far as the long routes are concerned, is entirely satisfactory. It is compensatory on the route between Chicago and New York. It has not been a paying service between Washington and New York, but it is more and more becoming perfected.

Now, only a moment on that section. The committee has transferred the aeroplane service from the steamboat and other power-boat service to the inland transportation, and we are providing for \$2,185,000 for that service. The reason is that we want the experiment made quickly, promptly, and effectively, so that if the Government is inclined to make permanent this service it may obtain it quickly. The complete experiments can not be made properly for less money than that. The committee raised the estimate of the department for that purpose.

By the way, I may say that the aeroplane service is one that is more expeditious by far than any other service, and the cost is perhaps twice that of any service, both as to postage and otherwise, but it is a service that will be in its nature special, and if used, and it probably will be, will be entirely compensatory. The motor truck has united the farm with the city, and brings the purchasers of commodities in the city to a close market with the country, and the country to the city, and so far has proved very effective.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. GARD. May I ask the gentleman to enlighten the House as to what the postage rates are for the carriage of mail by aeroplane?

Mr. MOON. Six cents for letters. There have been, I believe, 31 motor routes established. The experiment has been made upon 19 routes, where the facts have been fully collected and all information ascertained over a period beginning the 1st of July and ending the 30th day of September. That experiment shows that the Government of the United States has received a revenue from those 19 routes of \$8,889, net, over all expenses incurred in the operation. This would indicate that every route that might be established from a great city going out into the country for the collection of produce and carrying from the cities the goods to the country will be compensatory or self-paying. That service, if it is limited to the large cities, will have instead of 31 routes, now in force, some 250. That is practically the limit to which that service will go. Those routes will unquestionably yield a great revenue, and we have provided in this bill for \$1,000,000 for further experiment along that line.

These are the new features of the bill to which I call your attention. There is contained in this bill also that legislation which we passed in the last Congress reclassifying the railway mail clerks, the postal clerks, and carriers, fixing the compensation for them, and also the compensation for the rural carriers as fixed in the last bill. This bill seeks to make permanent the law that was temporary by the provisions of the previous bill. We provide here so that the postal clerks shall have that vacation when holidays come fixed by the President in pursuance of law that are had in the other departments of the Government. Strange to say, they have not enjoyed fully that privilege heretofore. A reclassification of all of the official positions in connection with the Post Office Department and a readjustment of salaries upon a basis that will be equitable and just is altogether essential at this time. There are divisions in this department where men sitting side by side, doing identically the same work through the same length of hours, where one clerk may receive \$1,200 and the other \$1,400, an inequality which calls for relief. We have provided, therefore, in this bill for a commission to be appointed under the provisions of the act that will look into the questions and reclassify the salaries and report to the Congress for its actions.

The other features of the bill are practically the same that are usually carried in the annual appropriation law. The increases granted in the amount necessary for the service are due to the normal increase in the service in the instances where it is increased, but where by reason of economy in administration services may be combined, and a decrease has been effected, that decrease appears on the face of the bill.

These are the features of the bill which I felt necessary to call your attention to before the discussion under the five-minute rule, when, of course, every paragraph of this bill will be thoroughly discussed, if not understood by the House, and such information given as we are capable of giving.

The Congress changed the method of compensation to railroads for carrying the mails a year or two since from the weight basis to the space basis, with which you are familiar. While under the new system the railroads are amply compensated for

the space used and the transportation of the mails, a saving of over twelve millions of dollars in the last fiscal year has been made to the Government by this change in the law.

Mr. Chairman, the development of the power of the Government under the section of the Constitution that authorizes the establishment of post offices and post roads has not only kept pace, but it has advanced beyond the development of many other powers of the Government as provided under the Constitution. We all understand the theory of our Government, that it is a representative Republic under a Constitution, that neither the Federal Government nor the State Government is a complete sovereignty; that is, the States have certain reserved rights (or the people thereof) that are sovereign in their nature that they alone can exercise. There are certain inalienable rights that neither State nor Federal Government has that belong to the citizens. The greatest of the three in the trinity of sovereignty is the Federal Government, and although we speak of its powers (as they are) as delegated powers, although we proclaim that the Federal Government can not go beyond the powers expressly granted to it in the Constitution, or those fairly implied from the powers granted to carry into effect those granted or delegated powers, still, though limited, the power is greater, tenfold greater, even in a few (much less all) the sections of the Constitution than all the powers that have been reserved to the States.

I shall not in this connection undertake to unfold the development and growth of governmental power under that clause of the Constitution that provides that Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce. I shall not undertake to show you, as I might, that under the banking and currency clause of the Constitution the Federal Government might drive all men out of the banking business and establish banks and loan money. Its powers under the sections where it has power delegated are exclusive. It is an omnipotent power, and all the other powers of Government may be called into requisition to enforce a single power within that Constitution, where fraud or injustice is attempted to be perpetrated upon the exercise of jurisdiction under the powers. So he who thinks that there is any supreme power in the United States that is effective save locally other than that delegated in the Federal Constitution has misconceived the extent of the Federal power.

What is the meaning of those simple little words in the Federal Constitution that Congress shall have power "to establish post offices and post roads"? Does it alone mean the place where letters may be deposited for the purpose of distribution to the people, carried by instrumentalities, by which they are distributed? Does it mean simply that you have the right to lay out the path to be traveled by the carrier under that clause? In view of the meaning of the terms as understood when the Constitution was framed it was impliedly, if not expressly, conferring upon Congress the exclusive jurisdiction to control, manage, and own, if it sees fit, every means of communication of intelligence. What have we done under that power in the control of intelligence or the communication of intelligence? We have said what mail matter may be sent. We have said it may be a letter, a postal card, a book, a newspaper, or a parcel-post package. We have defined the limit of the parcel-post package. If we can limit it to 50 pounds, we can, by the same power and authority, fix it at 100 pounds, and if at 100 pounds we can fix it at 1,000. There is no limit to the legislative discretion on this question. What as to the instrumentalities? We have called into requisition the pedestrian, the man with the vehicle, be it horse drawn or motor, and, as I have already said, the steamboat, the railroad, and the aeroplane.

Then if you have the right to do that, as you have, you have the right to establish the means by which the communication of intelligence can be conveyed. Then, necessarily, as an implied power from that expressed power in the Constitution, you have the right to own those instrumentalities. You have the right in your legislative discretion, which can not be controlled by the court or any other power on a question like this, the right to authorize the Government to own the thing out of which those instrumentalities may be made. How far, then, can you go in the exercise of that power? You can unquestionably own the vehicles, which you do own in many instances, by which the mails are carried and delivered. You can lease or own the steamboat or ship for that purpose; you can lease or own the railroad for that purpose, though under another power of the Constitution controlling commerce railroads may also be owned. You may own the telegraph and telephone for that purpose. It is a prime means of communication of intelligence more quickly, more expeditiously, than any that we have.

How much further can you go? If you can own the instrumentalities and own the things necessary to construct them,

can not you by virtually the same power own the coal mines that become necessary to give you the fuel to propel the engines and steamships that carry your mail? Can not you own the forests from which you obtain the material by which you can construct, as you have the right and the power to do, the cars and ships for this purpose? It may be said that Congress will never go so far as to extend this power along these lines, that it would be an invasion of the field of private enterprise that could not be and must not be tolerated. True enough. Let me tell you that when this wondrous Constitution is fully enforced and when all the power of the Federal Government both political and in the administration of its economical affairs has been fully developed, when every advantage to the Federal institution has been obtained that can be obtained under the Constitution, you will have in these United States an imperial republic greater than any Government in the exercise of its power that ever lived upon this earth.

The day is not far distant when the task of the American statesman shall be to ascertain to what extent the legislative, executive, and judicial discretion under the Constitution may prevail in the interests of the citizens and yet preserve strong, powerful, and effective Federal institutions. But, while these things are all true, there must be a proper development of the powers of government. The Post Office Department is entitled to every auxiliary that will give aid to the people in obtaining intelligence. This Government has the powers of a monopoly on this question. We ought to go to the verge of obtaining the means, at least, and the right to control the transmission of intelligence. That is done most effectually through the telegraph and telephone.

The postal system of the United States can not be, it will not be, more than half developed until these magnificent auxiliaries are attached to it, in my judgment, for the purpose not of an increase of revenue, though it would bring an increased revenue of many millions, perhaps hundreds of millions, but for the legitimate constitutional purpose of the maintenance of a post office system, the establishment of roads, the use of roads for that system; and when I say roads in this connection I mean the electric wire that flashes the intelligence from one part of the world to another quickly, as well as the established rural route. This is a progressive proposition for the development of a department under the Constitution, and provide it with the instrumentalities to which it is entitled to make it a perfect power in the interests of the people.

But, they say, you will invade the field of private business. My answer is that control of the means of communication of intelligence is a monopoly that under the Constitution belongs to the Government and if private individuals have exercised that power, as they have the power of government in other respects, there is no injustice of depriving them of it and restoring the power under the Constitution where it belongs and where it ever has been and must be if the Constitution is obeyed in the government of the United States. Then there are but a few of these great telegraph companies in the country to be effected. The Government should own them as a necessary auxiliary to the postal system. The Government should not enter upon this field without the slightest regards to the existing rights of the telegraph companies, although under the Constitution it might do so. It would neither be wise nor just to do it because the Government has tolerated the use of the telegraph and telephone by private companies, which are primarily a part of the system of the Post Office Department. Having procured the use of the means of intelligence which belongs to the department to be exercised by private corporations before taking it over it ought to compensate those corporations. Now this is no new question. I hold in my hand the Statutes at Large of the United States. You will find on pages 221 and 222 the act of Congress of July 24, 1866, on the subject of the telegraph.

I insert it:

Be it enacted, etc., That any telegraph company now organized, or which may hereafter be organized under the laws of any State in this Union, shall have the right to construct, maintain, and operate lines of telegraph through and over any portion of the public domain of the United States, over and along any of the military or post roads of the United States which have been or may hereafter be declared such by act of Congress, and over, under, or across the navigable streams or waters of the United States: Provided, That such lines of telegraph shall be so constructed and maintained as not to obstruct the navigation of such streams and waters or interfere with the ordinary travel on such military or post roads. And any of said companies shall have the right to take and use from such public lands the necessary stone, timber, and other materials for its posts, piers, stations, and other needful uses in the construction, maintenance, and operation of said lines of telegraph, and may preempt and use such portion of the unoccupied public lands subject to preemption through which its said lines of telegraph may be located as may be necessary for its stations, not exceeding 40 acres for each station; but such stations shall not be within 15 miles of each other.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That telegraphic communications between the several departments of the Government of the United States and their officers and agents shall, in their transmission over the lines of any of said companies, have priority over all other business, and shall be sent at rates to be annually fixed by the Postmaster General.

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, That the rights and privileges hereby granted shall not be transferred by any company acting under this act to any other corporation, association, or person: Provided, however, That the United States may at any time after the expiration of five years from the date of the passage of this act, for postal, military, or other purposes, purchase all the telegraph lines, property, and effects of any or all of said companies at an appraised value, to be ascertained by five competent, disinterested persons, two of whom shall be selected by the Postmaster General of the United States, two by the company interested, and one by the four so previously selected.

Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That before any telegraph company shall exercise any of the powers or privileges conferred by this act, such company shall file their written acceptance with the Postmaster General of the restrictions and obligations required by this act.

Approved, July 24, 1866.

The telegraph companies then recognized that they were seeking to invade the field of Federal jurisdiction on the question of the transportation of intelligence. The Congress recognized that fact, and therefore when in the first section they conferred certain powers upon the telegraph company, yielding to it in part its sovereignty in interstate matters and in the control and construction with reference to means of communication, giving to a private corporation a part of the power that the sovereign possesses, it reserved—what? The right to put an end at any moment to the private ownership of telegraph companies then in existence or that might thereafter be in existence. And we find in the third section of the act a power conferred to take over telegraph lines as an adjunct, where, in the Constitution, it belongs alone, to the Post Office Department. That third section provides that in pursuance of this act—and I quote not the language but the substance of it—the Congress may take over, own and control, and operate as a part of the postal system the telegraph lines of the United States.

It provides that a commission of five shall be appointed—two by the Postmaster General, two by the telegraph companies, and the fifth one by the four appointed—whose duty it shall be to investigate and appraise the value of the lines owned by different companies and report the same with a reasonable value to the Congress of the United States, that it may take over the lines. What did that mean? What was the interpretation of the Congress then? That must be its interpretation now. It was that the telegraph naturally, as a means of communication and the best means of communication, was inevitably linked with the Federal postal system and essentially a part of that system. Therefore, when private corporations were permitted to develop it and obtain the benefits to which the sovereign was entitled in the first instance it laid the burden by law on the corporation to abandon its hold upon this public instrumentality and, when Congress should demand, to return the telegraph where it once was, as an instrument auxiliary to the postal system of the United States. Hence the law, hence the construction, forsooth, not merely of the policy but of the constitutional right and privilege of the Congress to control this means of communication.

The time, in my judgment, has come when Congress must reassume its jurisdiction over this question for the benefit of the people. He, indeed, is foolishly inclined who thinks there is an invasion anywhere of private rights in doing so. It is but a resumption of the power of government temporarily abandoned and now proposed to be resumed. I have introduced a resolution which will carry into effect the provisions of the act of July 24, 1866.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I will.

Mr. GARD. Is it the gentleman's purpose to include this very interesting statute in his remarks so that we may have the benefit of it?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Congress is not without authority under the Constitution to extend its power and "to lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes" on every foot of American soil, but in doing it, if it undertakes the exercise of a power that is merely an implication upon an implication, entitled to be enforced by other provisions of the Constitution if necessary to its enforcement, it may run your Government, and will, into an imperialism. It may make the Federal head too strong. There may, and ought to be, perhaps, a limitation, as I have remarked, upon the legislative discretion in reference to these features. But will the country permit the Congress to be shorn of that power so clearly belonging to it; not as an implied power merely, but as a self-evident power under the terms of the Constitution? I hold, sir, that this postal system will have accomplished and can accomplish only half-way the purposes for which it was intended if you do not restore to its jurisdiction, the exclusive jurisdiction, the power

that it has under the Constitution to control every means of communication of intelligence, particularly the splendid, the magnificent means of communication—the telegraph.

You would let the Government be maimed and crippled in the exercise of its power and private corporations continue to exercise governmental functions if you refuse the right under this statute to the restoration of this instrumentality.

I know that there are two views of constitutional construction that must be considered. I speak not particularly of this telegraph question now, because I think that is too clear to need argument to elucidate it; but generally, in speaking of the construction of the Constitution and the powers under it, we can very readily demonstrate how a government may run to an excess on either view of construction. Why, a monarchy is the parent of despotism; the republic is a creator of liberty. An extreme monarchy is dangerous to human rights; an extreme democracy is just as dangerous to human rights.

The government with a constitution, the government with representatives under that constitution to enforce it, a government that is limited to the exercise of the powers of the constitution fairly, is the only safe government for a people. If you give over the great railroads of your country, with the millions of employees, to the control of government ultimately and finally—and that does not apply to the means of communication I have been discussing, of the telegraph—if you turn over the railroads of the country with its millions of employees, with the power under this section and under the commerce section of control, if you give the broad construction to all the other powers of government by which the forces of government in its administration may be increased in power and number, you will soon bring a condition under which the people will be forced to contest and to redeem the government from its employees. You will provide a dangerous despotism which must be avoided, I insist, at sometime by proper constitutional limitation.

Yet, on the other hand, if you so broaden the powers of the people as to destroy representative government, and shall leave to the people at the ballot box the determination of controversies between the citizens; if you shall, like ancient Athens, permit them to banish the citizen by the private ballot; if you shall give to the populace the means and exclusive right of a veto upon legislation, you will have destroyed the principles of human liberty, because you will have destroyed the spirit of the Constitution and representative government under it. But let us not fear any dangers of this sort when we simply bring back to the Federal Government and restore to its jurisdiction one of the arms of its administration to which it is entitled under the Constitution for the promotion of the business and social welfare of all the people.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I will.

Mr. BLACK. Has the Government of the United States ever owned any telegraph companies? Has it ever gone into the telegraph business? The gentleman says it will be simply restoring something to the Government.

Mr. MOON. Restoring the right.

Mr. BLACK. It has not been exercised?

Mr. MOON. The Government of the United States exercised the right to control the telegraph during and after the war of 1861-1865, just as it is doing now under the military power of the Government. But the telegraph companies were a new thing—

Mr. BLACK. Will not the gentleman admit there is a difference between the question of control and that of ownership and operation?

Mr. MOON. Oh, of course. Anyone in the world who knows the meaning of the English language knows that control means one thing and ownership another thing. My insistence is that under the Constitution you have not only the right of control which we have now under the law and which is exercised, exercising it strictly—and you always have had it—but you have got the right to own that instrumentality just as much as you have got the right to own the post office, just as much as you have the right to own the building in which you collect the mail, or the vehicles upon which it is carried.

But I want to depart from that discussion. I was only speaking of the danger of the exercise of some of our powers of government and the danger of the failure to exercise others.

There is not so much danger in the exercise of the power that will bring the beneficent results that the ownership of the telegraph and telephone will bring as in the exercise of a power, in my judgment, that would bring to this Government millions of employees, with high prices that would be established at the expense of other citizens of this Government.

But, Mr. Chairman, if I may be indulged for a few moments, under the license allowed in this debate, I will speak of that

all-absorbing question—our foreign relations and the duties and responsibilities of this Government. We need offer no apology for our entry into the great European war, because Germany, in the enforcement of her imperious will, sank our ships, murdered our citizens, and denied our international rights upon the high seas.

That alone was a sufficient justification for our entry into the war, and I would not place this war, which so far as we are concerned was waged against the Central Powers of Europe, upon any other ground than the just *casus belli* which I have mentioned. And yet it will be a source of profound pleasure to the world and to the American people particularly to know that that action inured to the benefit and protection of human rights throughout the earth.

Did you ever think that maybe the Government of the United States was primarily, by its teachings, responsible for the conditions that brought on this great European war? Have you forgotten that we have taught the doctrine of liberty and the equality of all men, and of government resting alone upon the consent of the governed, of equal opportunities and rights to the private citizen?

Have you forgotten that we discarded the doctrine of kings and of nobles and prevented the conferring of titles under the Constitution? That great position which the Government took in the affairs of nations has had its influence. It has influenced political action through all the years since the Constitution was framed. It has mollified by its influence unquestionably the power that Great Britain exercised under her unwritten constitution. It beckoned France to the contest for liberty in a republic against an imperial government. It encouraged the people in every section of the world who were demanding a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It was a wonderful doctrine to teach to a world benighted in despotism and inured not to citizenship, but to the position of slaves under imperial government for all the centuries.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. KING. Why are we fighting Russia to-day?

Mr. MOON. We are not fighting Russia. I know we have made no declaration of war against her.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman interrupted me with his question I believe I was speaking of the influence of the Government of the United States over the nations of the earth. We were teaching the doctrine that every man is an uncrowned king, that he is entitled to equal participation with others under the law and under the Constitution. There was another idea prevailing in a great portion of Europe. Germany was teaching the doctrine of "Kultur," the doctrine that whatever she saw fit to do she had the right to do, without regard to morality, truth, treaty stipulations, or religion.

Those ideas of government—one making for imperialism, with all power of government centered in the emperor, and the other, with all power of government centered in the individual citizen—were antagonistic. They could not forever contend in debate. They must find, finally, a solution on the field of battle. This great European contest was, therefore, a contest of ideas, a contest of two civilizations for the control of the destinies of men. The United States listened with profound interest as she heard the declaration of war by Germany against France. She listened with deep sympathy when Germany, hurling her legions to the gates of Paris, passed over the prostrate form of Belgium in violation of her treaty obligations. She listened when now chaotic Russia, then living under an imperial government, had caught the spark of human liberty and was moving her forces to the defense of the allies. She listened and heard the tread of troops beyond the sea pass down historic highways from the ancient city of the Caesars to the frontiers where liberty must live or forever perish. We saw the whole world lighting the conflagration of war. We entered it in defense of the rights of American citizenship. We went thither with two millions of men.

The lines of France and Great Britain and Italy were standing solid, receiving the shock of war from the advancing invaders, now receding and now advancing, until the tide of battle was rolled back by the French upon the Marne. We saw the second and third attacks with millions of men in the ranks of war. Then we saw the flag of the Republic cross the seas. We saw it unite her soldiers beneath it with the banners of Great Britain and France and Italy. We saw that onward movement that at last drove the Germans beyond the Rhine, that forced the abdication of the Emperor and the Crown Prince, and stayed not from their fall the tottering thrones of Bulgaria and Austria-Hungary. Under the influence exercised by the mighty power, under the mighty power of the arms of the allies the doctrine of human liberty has advanced over the earth. Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey plead for peace. Democracy triumphs forever over "kultur" and divine right of kings.

Mr. Chairman, it is a remarkable fact that upon that very day when the armistice was signed—November 11, 1918—the British forces operating in the Holy Land having destroyed the power of the Turk and pursued and driven his fleeing legions from Palestine and Syria, that her army quietly, with dignity, moved into the city of the immortal king, the sacred city of Jerusalem. And for what shall it be? The restoration, we trust, of a nation that has been scattered throughout the ages, a nation without a country, without a home, a nation whose sons have been born under every clime, and which in war and in peace has added honor, dignity, and prosperity to the land of the flag to which they adhered. Let us hope that Israel shall be united again and take her stand among the nations of the earth. We would not have the Jews who live in our great cities renounce their native land, or all those in Europe, perhaps, go back to the land of their fathers, but to the millions of Jews in Poland and central Europe and Asia it will prove an asylum of freedom.

Can we not see them as they return to the land of their father, protected against the despotism of Turkey, protected against that despotism even before the power of Turkey was asserted upon the banks of the Jordan? We see the Jews passing from every land in great caravans, going back to the home of their ancestors. Some pass—

Where Moab's rock a vale infolds,
Where the aged sire was laid alone
To slumber while the world grows old.

The tomb of Moses shall be a Mecca. They seek the caves where rest the bones of the progenitors of that great race. Some came by the Sea of Galilee. We see them with their Christian deliverers as they go down the streets of Jerusalem, stop at the market place where once was the house of Peter. They stop where the temple was, where the Christ boy contended with the wise men. They stop and witness the scenes along the highways of that beautiful city. They walk in Gethsemane. They go where Pilate sat in judgment. They go out on the road that led to Calvary, where He who spake as never man spake, bore the cross upon His back and wore a crown of thorns. They go there beholding no more the red crescent banner of the bloody Turk raised in despotism to sustain the creed of the false prophet Mohammed and to sanction murder, crime, and rapine, but behold floating from the very spot where the Son of man died for the redemption of the world the banner of modern Christian civilization, come to restore them to freedom forever. That is what this great war can do and will do for the Jewish people if rightly determined.

Mr. Chairman, my idea of democracy, and the hopes and aspirations of our people, was expressed in part by me in this House on the 9th of April, 1912, in a speech from which I quote as follows:

Let us rejoice to see the principles of democracy spreading over the earth; I do not mean a partisan democracy, but that great democratic thought that makes the world restless to-day; that great innate force for good that has actuated men in all the ages—the love of freedom, the love of justice; that love that finds for its habitat no particular section, but lives the world over; that great spirit of democracy that whispered words of hope into the ears of men before Aaron was a priest, Moses a prophet, or David a king—ever seeking justice, ever standing for the right—that spirit that survived the chariot wheels of the pagan warrior, the battle-axe of the Romans, thequisition of the Spaniards, and the cannons of Great Britain; that spirit that has lived to kindle the fires on every altar erected to human liberty, that has opened the doors of every temple where men worship their Creator in obedience to their own consciences; that has loosened the shackles of slaves and placed the crown on the brows of the martyrs to truth; that catches the humble boy by the hand and leads him into the path of rectitude and bids him follow it as the only open way to the pinnacles of immortal fame.

That spirit, standing under the shadow of the cross, that has echoed the divine proclamation for 2,000 years of "Peace on earth and good will to men"; that directed the hand that wrote the Declaration of Independence and hovered over the cradle of the Republic, may it live until every kingdom shall fall and every empire shall be dissolved, that government in obedience to the will of the governed may arise upon their ruins. Then the nations shall know that it was not the hand of man, but the fingers of God that fixed the stars on the flag of the Republic to light the path of liberty through all the ages to come.

Has that day dawned?

Shall the sun of human liberty continue to ascend until it reaches its zenith?

The mighty struggle in Europe is ended. Throne after throne has fallen. May republics arise on their ruins. On Monday, in Paris, there meets the greatest council that ever sat in the world's history. They shall determine, as far as their powers go, not merely the boundaries of Kingdoms and Empires and Republics, but they shall determine those questions that reflect the individual rights and welfare of great nations. And what can they do? We say that Germany must be punished. It is not for us to advise what that council shall do. We say that Germany must be made to pay the cost of the war, that Great Britain shall be indemnified, that the bleeding bosom of France shall be healed, that the tricolors which so gloriously floats over Ver-

sailles and Notre Dame to-day shall float forever nestling over Alsace and Lorraine.

We say that Belgium must be restored. If it can be done it should be done. But if the German Empire were sold to-day at the highest market price for every foot of her soil, if all the personal property that belonged to her people were converted into cash, if her 68,000,000 of people were given to slavery for 40 years, she could not compensate the world for the wrongs and injuries that she has done, even though the goddess of stern justice wrote the decree with her hand guided by the angel of mercy nestling at her side. There must be a peace, not of retaliation and revenge. The burden must be laid upon Germany and the German people and all their allies for the sins of their government as far as they can bear it, but Germany can not rightfully be destroyed by the decree of democracy. Her people must be given a government of their own. She may be shorn of her ships, she ought to be prohibited forever from the practice of those methods that would sustain the doctrines of her kultur. She ought to be deprived of her colonies and confined within the borders of her own home government, and given the right to proceed in the world to the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness that we have demanded for the nations of the world.

But what of the United States? What return shall we have for the generous gift of \$20,000,000,000 of money to the cause of liberty? What shall we have in return for the blood of "the bravest of the brave" that has been shed under our flag upon foreign lands in the defense of our rights and liberties and in support of the governments of Europe contending against the most imperial dynasties of all the ages? Nothing, nothing! We seek no reward. We ask no indemnity. We shall quietly withdraw the flag of the Republic from the banners with which it has been associated. Let us pray that it shall be returned over the soldiers of the Union without a star dimmed or a stripe tarnished, still the flag uncompromised in foreign lands or at home, that shall ever be the emblem of a great and free people exercising a supreme sovereignty under the Constitution, a sovereignty that must not and will not be impaired by treaty or otherwise, either for peace or for any other purpose. We love peace. We fight and we die for peace. But the peace that come to republics by the will of imperial arbitrators upon any great national issue where we desire to protect the constitutional rights and liberties of our people will not be the peace of freedom. It will be the peace of slavery. When our boys return we shall meet them with a greeting that is worthy of them and their valor; and as they bear our standard back to our shores a hundred millions of American citizens will salute it. The unconquered banner of an unconquerable people. "The flag to liberty given, whose every hue was born in heaven." [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads have agreed to the provisions of this bill making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and which carries in round numbers \$360,000,000. In other words, it appropriates for the expenses of carrying on this great service about a million dollars a day.

I think it is rather remarkable that in these times of partisanship the committee was, so to speak, unanimous on most of the provisions of the bill. The new legislation carried covers salary increases or making permanent the increases of a year ago.

The only two items that I recall on which there was a division and on which there probably will be a division when the bill comes up for consideration are the two items of aeroplane service and motor-truck service.

I will not now take the time of the House to discuss the objections to these items. I desire to say a few words in regard to the general postal service for the past year. We have noticed in years before that a great stress has been laid by the administration officials upon the ability to produce a postal surplus. As I pointed out a little more than a year ago, that desire to show a postal surplus went so far as to compile figures that were, if not erroneous, misleading, in the way they were placed, to show a surplus that did not, in fact, exist, and which I established by a Treasury Department statement made pursuant to my request. It wiped out the boasted surpluses of the 1915-16 period. After the detailed statement the whole was embraced in a summary, as follows:

Summary.

(Part 3.)

[Treasury gained (+); Treasury lost (-).]

1912	—\$1,575,988.80
1913	+ 2,389,018.12
1914	+ 3,134,973.06
1915	— 6,724,275.27
1916	— 300,362.22

Net loss 1912-1916 — 3,076,633.11

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, January 31, 1917.

However, the method of determining a postal surplus is simple. It consists under the law of 1835 of the difference between the audited receipts and the audited expenditures during the fiscal year. Of course, with expenditures and receipts exceeding a million dollars a day it is easy to postpone a few bills at the last end of the year, if you want to show a surplus that does not exist, but its punishment is that you will get a deficit the next year or year after, because these bills must be paid at some time. The practice I do not think has prevailed to any great extent, but the fact that it has been discussed in official reports by the department shows that there has been an exaggerated idea about the merits of a postal surplus. I think it is due to a mistaken idea of what the Postal Service is. The correct theory is that it is a public facility instituted to serve the people; whenever the receipts are not sufficient to pay for the service the rates should be increased, and when the rates are so high as to produce a postal surplus of some magnitude it would be the duty of Congress to either improve the service, make it more expeditious, reliable, and efficient, and improving the conditions of the personnel, the employees engaged in this arduous task of distributing the mails, or reduce the rates of postage. Therefore, it seems to me that a very large surplus or a very large deficit should be avoided.

The largest deficit we have had in recent years was in 1915 when there was a deficit of nearly \$12,000,000. Last year and this year the statement shows a considerable surplus. In fact, the difference between the audited receipts and the audited expenditures this year shows a surplus of nineteen and one-half million dollars, a very remarkable showing, especially in view of the fact that the salaries of nearly all the employees were increased. The expense of carrying on the service was also increased, and yet there is a surplus of nineteen and a half million dollars.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. In 1918 the only salaries increased were 10 below \$1,000. The letter carriers were not increased with the beginning of July 1, 1918, which would be reflected in the next fiscal year.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman will find that the salaries have been increased for the fiscal year of 1918 from what it was in 1917. Other expenses for carrying on the service increased. The star routes let that year were let at a higher price than formerly. Supplies were purchased at higher prices, and certainly the appropriations were increased, as the gentleman from Texas knows very well. Now, the wages have increased, and the price of supplies having increased all around, it is remarkable that there should be so large a surplus this year, and it is worth while, I think, to consider the reasons.

When I spoke about the increase in compensation of those who render services I did not include one of the most important parts of the service. I refer to the railway transportation. Remarkable as it may seem, the cost to the Government of transportation by rail of mail matter has very greatly decreased, but certainly the decrease has been accentuated very largely since the passage of the space-plan law of 1916, which went into effect November 1 of that year. It includes the whole of the fiscal year of 1918.

Before that law went into effect it was estimated by department officials that the per ton per mile cost of mail transportation, including railway post-office pay, was 10.26 cents. I have computed what it was last year. Now, that computation is based on the most accurate figures that have ever been obtained, for the reason that in the dispute between the railroad companies and the Government as to putting in force the space-plan law there was a general weighing of the mail matter throughout the United States. Formerly there was only a quadrennial weighing. Last year there was a complete weighing of the mail matter throughout the whole United States, all that transported by rail. Of course, some of the mail does not reach the railroad, but if it only traveled by rail a few miles it was included in the weighing. The weighing was continued for 35 days in the spring, and these days are supposed to have the most nearly average volume of mail.

I have figures here showing there was 826,000,000 ton-miles of mail. Of course, we do not usually compute mail by the ton-mile. We all know there are 2,000 pounds in a ton, and if you transmute the ton-miles into pound-miles you would have 1,652,000,000 pounds of mail carried 1 mile.

Now, if you simply carried a piece 1 mile, that would indicate the total volume of the mail; but the mail is carried more than 1 mile. It is believed that 400 miles represents the average haul, and some put it as high as 500 miles. If you divide that large sum of pound-miles by 400 we have about 4,225,000,000 pounds as the total weight of the mail that travels by rail.

Of course there is a percentage of mail that does not reach the railroads, and it has been estimated as high as 10 per cent. However, for the purpose of this argument here, I shall not take it into account. If you divide the total amount of railway mail pay as it is now—\$53,000,000—by the total number of pounds, you will find that during the fiscal year 1918 the railway mail pay was reduced to 6.4 cents per ton-mile, or, in other words, a reduction of nearly 40 per cent. They show in their reports how many car-miles have been saved. They reduce the service to 60-foot car-miles, and they show that 32,824,260 full 60-foot car-miles have been saved by the economy of placing heavier loads on each car. This "saving," they say, was equal to 15 trains of 10 cars each every day in the year between New York and Chicago. Instead of using the space they authorized—and you will find that on page 101 of the Postmaster General's report they used a less sum—here is their table:

Miles of service per annum prorated to 60-foot car basis:	
Nov. 1, 1916.....	272,794,837.13
June 30, 1918.....	220,290,652.83
Decrease.....	52,504,184.30
Per cent of decrease, 19.24.	
Total authorized rate of compensation per annum:	
Nov. 1, 1916.....	\$64,447,982.47
June 30, 1918.....	52,022,070.43
Decrease.....	12,425,912.04
Per cent of decrease, 19.28.	

How could that be done? As was stated by my colleague on the committee, Mr. MADDEN, it was saved by economy in loading. Instead of using the space authorized, they waited with a car until they could get a full load, and they are paying only for the space; and if they could get two loads on one 60-foot car, they would save one-half. They have actually saved, according to the best figures, between twelve and thirteen millions of dollars on their own basis. I have made a calculation myself from official figures.

I have taken the rate of pay as it was prescribed by the weight law and as they now pay and I find there is a difference of \$20,000,000 last year. Perhaps the department's estimate will be \$14,000,000, but it is immaterial whether it will be \$14,000,000 or \$20,000,000. That is a very large reduction, especially in view of the fact that the volume of mail has increased at a greater rate than ever before in the history of the country. Out of the 826,000,000 ton-miles that were transported by railway we know about how much there was of each class. It is desirable that each class should pay its way, and I think they are coming nearer to it now than ever before. This weighing of mail last year is the most complete determination of the total volume of mail that has ever been made. We can approximate the volume of each class. Two years ago the Post Office Department estimated after a sample count in the various offices that there were 1,000,000,000 pieces of parcels weighing nearly 2 pounds each. There has been an increase of probably 14 per cent since, so, too, multiplying the number by average weight of each piece, we get two billions and a quarter pounds. At the estimated income from those at 3 cents a pound, that would bring in some \$67,000,000. The second class is paid by the pound, and, of course, it is weighed when it is put into the post office, so that of all mail matter there is no kind whose quantity is so easily ascertained, because all you have to do is to look at the number of cents paid and you have the number of pounds. It amounted to 1,170,000,000 pounds, which is a little more than one-half of the volume of parcels, but it pays only between \$11,000,000 and \$12,000,000 of revenue. The third class, perhaps, amounts to thirty to thirty-five millions. That embraces small books weighing less than 8 ounces, all circulars, circular letters, and mail matter that really pays quite a good deal of revenue, so I presume there is a profit on that. The first-class mail is the most profitable of all. When mail rates were 2 cents an ounce, it was estimated that it took 45 letters to make a pound—they are so much underweight on the average.

Of course, if they weighed an ounce each, that would be 32 cents a pound, each letter having full weight, but the revenue from the first-class mail runs to about 85 cents a pound, or even as high as 90 cents, the estimates varying. In 1907 they figured it cost 49 cents a pound to transport and handle first-class mail. Of course, everybody knows it is more expensive; everybody knows that it ought to have, if it has not, a more expeditious way of being transported, and, in modern war language, it should be given priority. There are many pieces to the pound, and that fact necessitates a larger clerical force. But even at that they make a profit of about 40 cents a pound. This will, therefore, explain to you why we have a postal surplus this year.

I was about to analyze the reason for the present postal surplus. I have given one in the fact that there is a very large

reduction in railway mail pay of 40 per cent of the ton mileage from what it was some years ago before the space plan was inaugurated and because of the economies thereby accomplished. There has been a reduction in pay all of the way from \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000 in face of the fact that the volume of mail has been constantly increasing at the rate of 4½ to 5 per cent in weight. What is the other cause, if any there be, why the receipts are so large? The receipts were \$388,000,000. Of course, you all know that the war-revenue law imposes a 3-cent rate on first-class mail and a 2-cent rate on postal cards, but that was required by that law to be estimated monthly and paid into the Treasury as a war revenue. The Postmaster General has in compliance with that, as he says, estimated it at \$44,500,000 for the seven months after the passage of the act, until the end of the fiscal year. That leaves \$344,000,000 as the revenue at the old 2-cent rate. It is to be noted that the Postmaster General's report does not credit in any way the war conditions for any of the increase in revenues, but it blames the war for delays in the carrying of the mail. His excuse for slow transportation and for delay in the mail is war, but he never mentions that the great surplus he has produced is very largely due to the war. The detailed report of the department does show these two things. It shows that at the cantonments the first-class mail was enormous.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. If the surplus is due to war conditions, will the gentleman please explain in what way?

Mr. STEENERSON. I am about to do that.

Mr. AYRES. Very well.

Mr. STEENERSON. The war produced an abnormal increase in first-class mail, which is profitable—that is stating it in a very short word—and the details are found in the Postmaster General's report in reviewing these things.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Just wait a minute until I answer the first one. The gentleman must not load me up with two at a time.

Mr. AYRES. Certainly; that is all right.

Mr. STEENERSON. On page 6 he says:

The combined postal receipts derived from the military branch post offices, exclusive of money-order business, approximate \$1,000,000 a month, an amount greater than the receipts of a post office serving a city of 2,000,000 population.

Now, that is just here at home. Now, everybody with common sense can understand that when boys are sent away from their homes, from the farms and shops, to serve in the military camps here in the United States that letters will follow and letters will go from them home at a more numerous rate than before, so the war did stimulate first-class business, which shows a profit, as I have shown, of 40 cents a pound. In addition to that, if the gentleman will be patient, the Post Office Department report says that during the last fiscal year, 1918, the mail of our expeditionary forces abroad was not handled by the Post Office Department, except within the United States. All the mails—35,000,000 letters, first-class, and 15,000,000 and 16,000,000 parcels—they say were delivered to the military forces at the port of embarkation. There is no dispute about that; but here, on page 9, I think it is, they go on to say—I will read it:

With the taking over of the mail by the military authorities the Post Office Department was at once furnished with the list of the units in France and the field postal stations with which they are being served. The Army organized a postal corps of 1,885 enlisted men and 115 officers—

And so forth.

So there are 2,000 men who acted as postal clerks in distributing this mail, and consequently the Post Office Department, which received the revenue, was relieved from paying those 2,000 clerks which they would have done if they were not turned over to them by the military authorities.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. STEENERSON. What is on the gentleman's mind?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The military did not take over the Postal Service until nearly the close of the last fiscal year.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. When did the military take it over?

Mr. STEENERSON. It says here the beginning of the fiscal year, June 30, 1917. No; on pages 6 and 7 the report of the department says the military took control June 1, last.

Mr. MADDEN. If my colleague will yield to me, the transportation charges across the ocean were eliminated also?

Mr. STEENERSON. I am coming to that. Now, here is a case where there is stipulated the amount of first-class mail which is profitable, and there is some profit upon the parcels going to foreign countries which are light in weight and pay a

very large rate, because they are outside of the average zone. These military transports carried that mail, and they never paid them a cent. Hence you will find that the expense of the foreign mail which goes on ships carrying mail last year was at least \$1,000,000 less than it was before. Why? With 2,000,000 soldiers and all the civilians that followed over into Europe, imagine the volume of mail that went across which paid first-class and parcels, and yet the payment for transportation by ships across the ocean was decreased.

If they had been carried under the legal rate on ships going abroad I venture to say it would cost \$3,500,000 or \$4,000,000 in addition. If we had furnished 2,000 clerks abroad, say, at \$1,500 apiece, that would be \$3,000,000, and presumably the clerks abroad would have cost \$4,000,000. That expense was saved or avoided by the Postal Service, but they got all the revenue. Now, I am speaking of this not in criticism of the Post Office Department, not at all, but I am speaking of it because I want to show you that the large postal surplus of this year is not due to a normal state of business and that it can not be expected to continue in the future. We can not expect to have this enormous volume of domestic first-class and foreign first-class and parcel-post mail after the war ceases, and if it does continue you can expect that the expense thereof will be charged to the Postal Service and not to the War Department. Now, this accounts, more than accounts, for all the surplus. If we take these things into account there would be a deficit of very nearly \$20,000,000, in my opinion. But assuming that we will have prosperous times in the future, we may avoid such a loss. Now, with regard to the railway service let me say this: I used to be considered a granger and for many years advocated stringent laws with reference to railroads, and I was sent to the legislature as an antirailroad member, representing the people. I do not believe I have any particular prejudice in favor of railroads. In regard to railway mail pay, I would say I believe it is the correct principle that we should pay for all the service rendered at a compensatory rate, at a fair rate; that you should not compel anybody to work for less than the service is reasonably worth. I do not care whether it is a railroad company or an individual. In the space-plan law we provide a \$1,000 fine to any railroad company refusing to carry the mail at the rates prescribed by the Postmaster General, and when we have made a penal offense of \$1,000 to refuse to carry this stuff, is it fair for us to turn around and say, "You must carry it for less than it costs you"? Evidently that would not be fair. If the compensation of the railroads by the space plan has decreased 25 per cent it is a question whether in the face of increased operating expenses it is compensatory.

The Government increased railroad freight rates 25 per cent, entailing an extra burden on the people of \$600,000,000 per annum, but the freight it ships in the form of mail enjoys a reduced rate. Consequently the small country merchant, whose freight bills are increased, has a harder time to meet his city competitor, who distributes his merchandise by mail and enjoys the same old rates. In 1900, in fact as late as 1901, I think, the proportion of postal receipts paid for railway transportation was 36 per cent. It gradually was reduced until it came down to 21 per cent. In 1915 it was 21 per cent; last year it was 17 per cent of the total receipts.

Statement of total postal receipts and expenditures for railroad transportation of mails, 1900 to 1918, inclusive.

Year.	Postal receipts.	Railroad transportation.	Per cent of total postal receipts paid to railroads.
1900.....	\$102,403,000	\$37,300,000	36
1901.....	111,609,000	38,200,000	34
1902.....	121,800,000	39,500,000	32
1903.....	134,209,000	41,400,000	31
1904.....	145,600,000	44,000,000	31
1905.....	152,800,000	45,000,000	29
1906.....	167,900,000	47,000,000	28
1907.....	183,600,000	50,000,000	27
1908.....	191,500,000	48,500,000	25
1909.....	203,600,000	49,900,000	24
1910.....	224,100,000	49,400,000	22
1911.....	237,900,000	50,600,000	21
1912.....	246,700,000	51,700,000	21
1913.....	266,600,000	52,000,000	19
1914.....	287,900,000	56,200,000	19
1915.....	287,200,000	59,600,000	21
1916.....	312,000,000	61,700,000	20
1917.....	329,700,000	62,700,000	19
1918.....	344,000,000	61,000,000	17

The practice of express companies of paying 50 per cent of receipts has recently been adopted by the United States Railroad Administration. That business is analogous to parcel post, only

there is no limit on weight of packages. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], pointed out that there had been delay in the mail. The Postmaster General's report boasts of the number of car-miles that they have saved. If by the economy in loading, as it is said, you can save half the transportation by holding a car until the end of the day, if you thereby delay the letters for New York or Philadelphia one day it is poor economy. You pay the railroad company less, but you do more damage to the business public.

Now, it is not a sporadic complaint that comes to us. It is universal. I venture to say that there is not a Member of this House who has not had complaint about delay in the mail. And the Postmaster General's report seeks to excuse that by war conditions. Ever since the European war began the war has been the goat of the Post Office Department. When there was a lack of revenue, the war was blamed. They never give credit. This war is now blamed for delay in the mail. If a man waits two days to get a letter from Yonkers down to Wall Street, in New York City, they say it is war conditions that are to blame. I received a telegram yesterday from the Merchants' Association of New York, in which they say that they have timed the passage of letters from one part of New York City to the other, and that it took a day and a half or two days.

But I think my colleague on the committee [Mr. MADDEN] hit the nail exactly on the head when he said that it was due to an inordinate desire to economize by loading too heavily under the space plan. They have taken off these thousands of cars, which they say they have saved, and they have had fewer dispatches of mail. Now, that is all right, so far as merchandise is concerned, but it will not do for first-class mail. It seems to me it is strange that the department has not awakened to the fact that this is the cause. They can not have this war to blame forever. It will soon end, possibly. And I think you will find that if they continue to get the mail service from the railroads at the present economic rate, there will be a less quick dispatch than there was formerly. If space plan as operated reduces the pay below a fair compensation it is unjust. If, on the other hand, it delays the mail, it is unwise and expensive. But I almost forgot to say that this saving upon which the department places so much emphasis—the saving in railway mail pay—has not yet been sanctioned. This is a most remarkable thing. They count it as absolutely saved before they know. The space-plan law had a provision to the effect that the existing law for transportation of mail, except as therein modified, shall continue in effect until the Interstate Commerce Commission, under the provisions thereof, fixed a fair and reasonable rate of compensation for such transportation service. And then it goes on and gives them jurisdiction to determine whether the space plan is fair and just and whether the rate prescribed in the space plan is correct or not. And then it provides that, except as the department, for an experiment, puts it into effect, the rates under the old law shall continue. Now, when that was put in there it was supposed they were going to experiment with a small part. A great many people thought it was that, a small part of the railroad. But they put the space plan into effect throughout the whole United States, except on routes that were simply too light in traffic to justify hiring 3-foot compartments. Under the space plan they are divided into 3-foot, 7-foot, 10-foot, 15-foot, 30-foot, and 60-foot space, car length, and where the mail was so light they could not afford to pay even for 3 feet, then they continued it under the old law—under the weight plan. All the routes of the United States are put under the space plan, and they have computed the pay and paid them under the space plan, although the law said it should not take effect until a favorable decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Now, I went down there to get the exact amount they would pay under the space plan. It seems these two plans are in force to-day. "If the Interstate Commerce Commission decides that the space plan is unjust, then what would you pay?" They could not tell me. They know what they have paid.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. In reference to the space plan, do they work the mail on the train under that plan?

Mr. STEENERSON. To some extent, but to a very much less extent than they did formerly, because they do not authorize space enough to work it. In fact, Mr. Praeger, I believe, last year, or his man in charge of the Railway Mail Service, said that they have reduced the railway mail clerks by 1,200. They are put in as distributors in the terminals.

Mr. MANN. How do they arrange about local mail that is put on the train at all stations?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, that is not distributed at all. That goes by to some other post office, where they open it and send it back. There has been a great deal of complaint about that.

There are a lot of mail cars that have no clerks on, and no mail can be put on such cars.

Mr. MANN. Now, let me ask you a question for information. Take the Illinois Central Railroad, running from Cairo to Chicago. There are a great many stations along the line of the road—post offices. When they put their mail sack on the train is the mail worked on the train?

Mr. STEENERSON. No. It has got to be worked at the starting point and put into a separate sack for each of those small places, and the pouches are thrown off.

Mr. MANN. I am talking about the mail that is put on the train at the small places. Part of the mail goes to Chicago.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think in most cases it goes to Chicago.

Mr. MANN. Part is addressed to Chicago, part is addressed to New York, part is addressed for eastern points, and part addressed to western points. Say, on a train going north, that mail is put on the train. Is that mail worked on the way to Chicago or not worked until it gets to Chicago?

Mr. STEENERSON. I would not be positive about that, although I have been on those mail cars several times since the space plan was inaugurated. But I do know that a great deal less mail is worked in transit than before, because they have not got the space in the cars.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it not a fact that practically on all railroad lines they have what are called local mail trains, and that on those local mail trains the mail is worked by the postal clerks on the postal cars, although perhaps on the fast through trains that carry mail that is not done?

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I have had a great deal of trouble about that kind of a case, where they will not furnish the clerks to work the mail even on those trains. You have got to assort it at the beginning of the route and put it in a separate pouch, and that pouch is thrown out.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Pardon me. Suppose I mail a letter at my home town, on the Chicago & Great Western road, 140 miles west of Chicago, and address it to Freeport, Ill., about 35 miles away. My understanding is that that mail sack from my local home town is put on the train and is thrown on the table, and that letter that would be addressed to Freeport, Ill., would be thrown into a sack that would go to Freeport, and so on. It would not be sent to Chicago and sent back.

Mr. STEENERSON. That may be, if they have a clerk to do it. They do not have them on all cars.

The saving by means of the space plan can not be said to be an accomplished fact, for its justice and validity are yet to be determined. An adverse decision might wipe out all this surplus. It is a little premature to count this as an absolute surplus, because we have this contingent liability, depending on the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There is a provision in this bill authorizing, I believe, \$2,300,000 for motor-truck service. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], the chairman of the committee, explained how enormously profitable the motor-truck service has been. The hearings before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads justifies that statement, and the Post Office Department report justifies it. They made about 80 per cent profit on this motor-truck service. However, upon cross-examination the Assistant Postmaster General admitted that in arriving at the income of the motor-truck service on those routes they counted all the postage. So I asked them if a letter or parcel that came from Manila, say, to Hawaii, and from Hawaii to San Francisco, and from San Francisco to Harrisburg, was put on a route from Harrisburg down to the East, they would count the postage on that as having been earned by the motor-truck service, and he had to admit that that was the case. They count all the postage that all these packages bear, and then they have a system of figuring that easily can be found to be false. I have not the time to go into it, but it stands to reason that it can not be possible that you can make such an enormous profit in carrying parcels if you count all the expense. It may be that there is a day or two or a month or two or three months in a year where you have this profitable business, but there may be months or half a year or more when there is little or no business. And the remarkable thing about this motor-truck service is that they parallel the railroads. They run parallel in most every instance to an existing railroad line, and the railroads, of course, are anxious for business. How is it, then, that by motor trucks you can carry at such a vast profit this business which otherwise would be moved by rail? It may be, but I can not understand it. I have my doubts, and consequently I have my doubts about appropriating this vast sum.

There is another thing that I want to call attention to when we come to discuss that item, that under the provision of a

law which was placed as a rider on the Post Office appropriation last year they are furnished trucks for nothing by the War Department. They are turned over free, and, of course, that item of cost does not appear.

Now, under this item they are going to spend \$2,300,000, and some say it will be increased to \$10,000,000. It is not segregated—so much for automobiles, and so much for this, and so much for operation, and so much for the chauffeurs. Oh, no. It is simply a lump sum, and it includes improvement of roads. It might be all used for the improvement of roads, and it might be all used for automobiles, in the discretion of the Postmaster General. You remember how hard we fought here when we passed the road law. We wanted a correct apportionment. We did not want to trust the discretion of the Postmaster General in distributing the money for roads, and so we made a careful calculation, that was very fair, that was not to discriminate against localities or States. But under this, in these times of war, they say we must confide in the Government, and therefore they give it discretion to build roads wherever they please.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I wish to ask the gentleman about the provision for the improvement of highways, in line 18, page 23, of the bill:

The improvement of highways, the purchase, manufacture, exchange, and repair of equipment—

And so on. That is a change of existing law. My impression is that those words "the improvement of highways" were slipped in there; that that subject was not before the committee.

Mr. STEENERSON. I can not remember that I heard of that in the committee at all. I was out trying to frame another provision, and perhaps it happened while I was out.

Mr. MOON. That whole paragraph is new.

Mr. STEENERSON. This is a new provision. I have here the committee print which shows exactly what is new. The new parts were printed in italics. I presume it is a new version of a part of an old law:

For experimental motor-vehicle truck service in such localities of the United States as the Postmaster General may select, the establishment and extension of such service, the improvement of highways, the purchase, manufacture, exchange, and repair of equipment, supervision and maintenance, and expenses incidental to conveyance and marketing of produce and commodities, \$1,000,000.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does the gentleman contend that the phrase "improvement of highways" was in last year's law authorizing the experiment with motor trucks?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will read the section of the current appropriation act. It is section 7 of last year's appropriation act:

SEC. 7. That to promote the conservation of food products and to facilitate the collection and delivery thereof from producer to consumer, and the delivery of articles necessary in the production of such food products to the producers, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes in the vicinity of such cities of the United States as he may select, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and the cost of such experiments, not exceeding \$300,000, may be paid by the Postmaster General out of any unexpended appropriations of the Postal Service, and the Postmaster General shall report the result of such experiments to the Congress at the earliest practicable date.

The gentleman is absolutely right. There is nothing about highways in last year's law. In fact, I did not know it was in there at all until I saw this bill printed; but we have waived all points of order based on the fact that it is new legislation, so that we will have to debate it on the merits when the time comes.

There is another item here that carries \$2,185,000 for airplane service. That is in addition to the fact that this law authorizes the War Department to furnish the airplanes for nothing.

Mr. MOON. May I suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota that when we removed the airplane proposition from the steamboat proposition, with which it was heretofore connected, by the action of the committee we reduced the steamboat proposition from \$245,000 to \$185,000 and we did not increase the inland transportation appropriation at all, so that the airplane appropriation now falls under the inland transportation appropriation without any increase whatever in the totals.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MOON. So if it should transpire that a reduction can be made in the use of the money for inland transportation by the use of it for airplanes, there can be nothing lost in that case.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman from Tennessee points out that this appropriation for airplanes is taken out of the appropriation for transportation of mails by railways and that

it does not increase the total. It does, however, increase the amount that could be spent for airplanes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If my friend will pardon me, in connection with the airplane proposition I want to ask a question.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I notice here in the airplane proposition an appropriation of \$2,185,000, which provides for the purchase of airplanes and the operation and maintenance of the airplane service. I wondered if the committee took into consideration in connection with that matter the possibility of making available the Army and Navy airplanes that probably will go out of actual service when peace is consummated, instead of purchasing them?

Mr. STEENERSON. The committee were aware that the law of last year did authorize the turning over of these airplanes to the Post Office Department, and they were told at the hearing that the department might also purchase airplanes from private manufacturers.

Now, \$2,000,000, or nearly \$3,000,000, for these two items is a liberal amount for an experiment. I want to call attention to another remarkable thing about automobiles, seeing we are on the automobile subject.

For a great many years the mail in the large cities was transported from the station to the post office and back again by what they called the screen-wagon service. That was a contract service. Two or three years ago it was abolished, and automobiles owned and operated by the Government were substituted. Part of the service in the cities was also performed by underground tubes. The service performed by the tubes was similar to that which was performed by the screen-wagon service. That is, it transported the mails between the station and the post office. The amount required when the Government had these contracts was \$2,300,000.

This year we appropriate \$6,700,000. There has been an increase of nearly 300 per cent in the cost of transporting the mail in the cities. Why should that be? The Post Office Department tells us that they have accomplished a wonderful saving this year. My colleague, Mr. MADDEN, has asked several times how it could be that they claimed such a saving last year. They said we are saving because we asked for no more this year than we asked last year, and there has been a growth in the mail service. We passed the bill, and then they went over to the Senate and had it increased \$735,000. So automobiles seem to be in favor, although the expense of transporting the mail in the cities has increased nearly 300 per cent in three years, or at least 250 per cent, and they still say that they are saving us a large amount. They say that they are going to save us millions by the motor-truck and automobile, and other millions are going to be saved with great expedition of the mail by aeroplanes.

I may be of a suspicious nature, but it looks to me as though the automobile industry, which everybody knows is a great combination, having the most complete organization in every State in the Union, beyond that of any other manufacture or mercantile branch in the world, have great influence in this matter. They hold conventions, good-roads meetings, and put through constitutional amendments seeking to appropriate millions and millions of dollars of the States in order to build roads upon which joy riders can ride from Chicago to Frisco. Of course they do not reach the backwoods in my district with their fine macadam roads that cost \$20,000 a mile, but they are doing a good work no doubt for roads, and they do good work for the automobiles. They are selling automobiles by the million, and they certainly have a good customer in Uncle Sam. He buys all the automobiles, and they are used up in three or four years, and yet the expense of this item is enormously increased.

Evidently they propose to wipe out the railroads altogether, because the motor-truck routes are paralleling the railroads. They say they can do it for about one-fifth. At least they do it for one-fifth of the postal revenue, as they figure.

It must be that the Post Office Department intends to supplant railroads by motor trucks, and, as the gentleman from Tennessee said, they may in time be prepared to carry a 1,000-pound parcel-post package. Instead of having railroads we will have motor-truck routes with steel-surface highways. Evidently there is a movement on the part of the automobile industry, which includes the aeroplane industry and the Oil Trust, to wipe out every other kind of transportation. They have wiped out the underground transportation in New York City and substituted automobiles, thereby selling new ones, and they now propose to wipe out the railroads, because they can get automobiles from the War Department, and no railroad can compete with them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am much interested in the matter of motor transportation. Can the gentleman say whether in the estimate of the cost of transportation the amount of depreciation and loss caused by the upkeep and subsequent casting aside of the automobile has been fairly taken into consideration?

Mr. STEENERSON. I think the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General has covered everything. If he has not, he will; he is the most expert talker I ever listened to, and if he can not explain it nobody on earth can. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How about his figures?

Mr. STEENERSON. I have not had time to analyze them, but I wish the gentleman from Iowa, who is on the Ways and Means Committee, would take hold of Mr. Blakslee's figures. I am afraid if he did there would not be much left. As it is, he proved before the committee that, like Col. Sellers, there were "millions in it; millions in it." That is the way the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General talked about motor trucks. Evidently he wants to wipe out transportation by railroads, and the motor-truck manufacturers are with him. They are going to do it not only by means of that sort of transportation, but by aeroplane transportation.

Well, although I was the first man to ever offer an appropriation of \$50,000 for the experiment in aeroplane transportation of mail, I have not gone wild over the idea. I asked them when they were going to have it out in St. Paul and Minneapolis, in my State. They said in the spring. I did not want my territory to be overlooked. Minneapolis, for instance, and St. Paul can have their letters mailed in the evening at 7 or 8 o'clock and at 9 o'clock in the morning or 10 o'clock in the morning they are in Chicago. That is almost as good as transportation by aeroplanes, because people would not be up during the night and the mail would not be delivered.

Mr. MOON. Then the gentleman would not want the more expeditious service out there, would he?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say to the gentleman that I have not finished yet. [Laughter.] I do not think it will amount to anything; but besides the aeroplane mail we have the telegraph. We can telegraph in a few hours if we could have as good service as we had before the war, but the war has disorganized everything in the way of telegraph service, so that service is not as good as it used to be. But if we have normal times I could telegraph Chicago and get an answer back in an hour. If you do not want to do that, you could telephone. You could telephone from Milwaukee at a reasonable rate, and I can not see any very urgent necessity for carrying mail by aeroplanes between these points. Yet if the rest of the country is going to have this spectacular service—this great means of advertising the department worthy of George Creel—we want it in Minnesota.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I note what the gentleman said about efficiency and the figures of the department, especially of the Fourth Assistant. Does the gentleman think the efficiency found in this department would warrant the Government in buying the telegraph and telephone lines so as to extend opportunities for efficiency in the Post Office Department?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall undertake to answer the question of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], although I had not intended to discuss that feature. If he desires to have my view upon it, I shall be very glad to give it.

Mr. SLOAN. I certainly desire it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] upon that point with great attention. I thought at one time he was going to decide against Government operation of both telephone and telegraph and the railroads. He cited the Constitution as thoroughly as any constitutional lawyer could, with great emphasis. In my view, there never was any constitutional question about this matter. I do not believe anyone can raise a question of whether the United States has the power and authority under that clause of the Constitution granting it power to establish post offices and post roads, to own and operate telephones and telegraphs. I believe they can, and it was quite unnecessary for the gentleman from Tennessee to convince me it was constitutional. Moreover, I will say this, that in the nature of things communication by telephone and telegraph is very similar to communication by letter, and therefore there is nothing inherent in the difference that would preclude the Government from performing one function as well as the other. I believe in Government ownership and operation of a public utility like this whenever it appears

likely that the public will thereby be served more efficiently and economically, but whether this will prove true as to any or all of these telephone and telegraph companies is a question that ought to be carefully considered.

If there exists a valid objection it is not founded on constitutional grounds. The gentleman from Tennessee, in pursuing the subject, did come very near to the real point of objection. While I should like and I hope to see some day when the Government shall operate the Postal Service, including the telegraph and telephones, with efficiency and without partisanship or politics, without carrying on a publicity campaign throughout the year to make things true that are not true, advertising surpluses that do not exist—if it should become a business institution free from politics—then I think I should like to see that department carry on this other activity.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman will excuse me until I have finished. There is another objection, not founded upon the ability of the Government to do the business, not founded upon the Constitution, but founded on the same objection that exists to assuming the numerous functions of railway transportation and various other things that we have been doing during the war. I said the gentleman from Tennessee came very near pointing out the objection, but he did not pursue it to its final logical conclusion. The real objection to assuming all these activities at this time lies in the fact that it is dangerous to free institutions. [Applause.] History and logic and science all tell us the reason why there is and must be a difference between the organizations of society in a militant state and in a peaceful state. The problem of republics has always been to develop military capacity without developing the military spirit; in other words, without becoming an autocracy or a despotism. I think one of the greatest accomplishments of any people in the world was what the American people did in organizing for war. It was not only an organization that was compelled and required by law, but an organization inspired by voluntary effort upon the part of the people.

A military organization depends upon rank. There is a regimentation from the common soldier to the sergeant, to the lieutenant, to the captain, and so on up to the general and commander in chief. One head must control it in order to make it efficient and hurl it at the enemy. It has been the history of the world that no industrial society organized upon liberal principles could be efficient in war. This has been thrown up against us always, and against a republican form of government, because of inefficiency in war. You have not got the organization.

De Tocqueville, in his *Democracy in America*, says:

All nations which have been obliged to sustain long and serious warfare have consequently been led to augment the power of their government. Those who have not succeeded in this attempt have been subjugated. A long war always reduces nations to the wretched alternative of being abandoned to ruin by defeat or to despotism by success.

It was fortunate for us that we were not called into battle instantly, because over there the allies held the fort while we were coming for a year or more. We had in that time an opportunity to change from the peaceful, industrial, mercantile society into a militant society. Hence Congress was asked to confer these powers upon the President, and we readily, without regard to party, showered these powers upon him, almost buried him. The President has still to do this and to do that. As a matter of fact, he has to depend upon hundreds of thousands of agents whom he never sees to do these things. That was necessary and proper. I think it is Ferraro, in his work on militarism, that lays down this rule, that where militarism is developed to its highest point, there the army is the people mobilized, while in time of peace the people are the army quiescent. It is so complete that it only requires notice of conflict to become a military machine.

I once read an article, written by a man whose name I have forgotten, on the life of Lincoln—a very thoughtful article—and in it he mentioned this doctrine about militarism; and he says that the example of Washington, followed by the example of Lincoln, after engaging in the Revolutionary War and in the Civil War, the American people following their lead and laying down a military organization and becoming an industrial and peaceful community was the most wonderful thing in history. If the American people look upon that as a lodestar to follow, then our institutions will be safe. If, on the other hand, the same thing should happen here as happened in the ancient States of Greece and Rome, and we continue a military organization, a complete unit of command, then popular government will be destroyed. In comparatively modern times we have Napoleon as an example. He was elected first consul, but after he had engaged in those wars and had his armies complete, then what was the use of having an election? There was not a Pope good

enough to crown him. He was the autocrat supreme, and he placed the crown on his own head. There you have autocracy grown out of militarism. Have we not these lessons before us? The army was the controlling power. Have we not the lessons on this continent to the south of us, coming where military despotism has prevailed? The danger of assuming the telegraph, the telephone, and the railroad systems consists, as suggested, in the installation of an army of millions of men whose tenure of office and whose compensation are dependent upon the party in power.

If you have three or four or five million Government employees, with their friends, how long will it be before, by increase of salary or promise of increase, a President can perpetuate himself, either in his own person or in the person of his son-in-law or some other relative? I say that there never was a greater menace to the very foundations upon which our Government rests—popular, representative government—than in the piling up of these Government activities, however efficiently those activities may be performed. It is not a question whether the Government can perform these activities; it is a question of what becomes of your country. If we disregard the sanctified example of George Washington, who laid down his power to go back to his farm; if we disregard the glorious example of the immortal Lincoln, who had an army larger than any Caesar or Napoleon ever had; if we do not follow the advice of Grant that the people go back to their farms, where they will need their horses for their spring plowing, and assume peaceful occupations, but proceed to install millions and millions of Government employees by virtue of the perpetuation of the conditions which existed during the war, then it necessarily must follow that any man who reaches the presidential chair can, if he so desires, perpetuate his office, and the voice of the people will be overcome.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. STEENERSON. I was just answering the gentleman's question. [Laughter.] I will yield, although the answer is not complete.

Mr. SLOAN. Just at that point, in the matter of granting that power, this control and ownership, what does the gentleman have to say about the other countries that have exercised this function? Do not they generally deprive the public officials, the servants who do this work, of the right of franchise before assuming the power?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not know.

Mr. SLOAN. They do; they say in some of the European countries—

Mr. STEENERSON. But they have a more complete and developed civil-service system. In nearly all foreign countries they have a civil-service system that is as nearly as possible free from politics, and we have not as yet. We hope to have it some day, but have not as yet. Government is growth and development, and I do not believe we can expect to have such a civil-service system for some time. If we had it now and it was so that these employees who are proposed would not interfere with politics and destroy the very institutions upon which our Government rests, I would not object. In itself it seems very meritorious, but there is another thing—

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. MOON. If I gathered from the gentleman correctly, he not only does not doubt the constitutional power but he thinks it would be a proper thing provided we can administer the matter properly?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is it exactly. I think the gentleman from Tennessee agrees with me somewhat if there was no danger.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Let me say one word before I yield to the gentleman from Michigan. I want to say that war brings many evils, and among others is the evil of profiteering, and I believe that the man who unduly profits by war conditions, whether in manufacturing or in commerce or otherwise, that the war profiteer is the most despicable person on the face of the earth. [Applause.] But worse than he, I say, is the man in power who by reason of war conditions tries to embezzle the power given him by reason of war conditions and will not disgorge them after the war is over. [Applause.] I say when you give me the power because of war, and when the reason for it is over and I seek to make it impossible, I am not acting in good faith; it constitutes an embezzlement of power which is worse than profiteering. [Applause.] Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not true under private ownership of telephone lines, or telegraph lines for that matter, all

persons can use them to their fullest extent and to their utmost desire? Now, what is to be gained by Government ownership?

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I will say to the gentleman that he has omitted one main reason which he ought to advance.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is what I would like to know.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is when you intrust your message in a hot campaign to the Western Union or the Postal Telegraph Co. or the telephone company you know that they are in duty bound to keep it secret, and if you have Government employees politically influenced, where are you? Are they not going to disclose in a secret way the very message upon which your election depends, or will they not refuse to transmit or delay the message until the occasion for it has gone? There is a vast danger in partisan manipulation of telephone and telegraph services which we must weigh before we determine that question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. But aside from war time and political campaigns, when we are having normal times I would like to know whether there is any advantage, and if so what the advantage is, in having public ownership, if there be any?

Mr. STEENERSON. If I have not spoken in vain, the gentleman appreciates there can be efficient service under both, and I have not said one was going to be very much more efficient than the other.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is what I wanted to hear.

Mr. STEENERSON. The bonds and stocks of these wire companies, I am told, are over \$2,000,000,000; the revenue about \$415,000,000 annually. There are over 20,000 farm telephone companies. There are 927 reporting to the Interstate Commerce Commission of over \$50,000 annual receipts. There are 9,585 smaller companies that filed reports. The employees number hundreds of thousands. Just why cooperative farm telephone lines should be seized by the Government as a war necessity no one understands. Is it simply to carry out a fixed desire without consulting the people? I will insert an address on rural telephones in Europe, by G. Odell, that is very instructive.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. Then, one of a somewhat cautious or suspicious nature like myself might infer from what the gentleman says that the management of the Post Office Department has not been entirely devoid of politics during the last five or six years?

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I do not believe I can answer that. I take for absolute verity the statement made from this rostrum that politics were adjourned, and consequently I must decline to go into any details.

Mr. SLOAN. As I understand, the gentleman does that personally, but the gentleman does not assume to do it for the House, because some of us might not entirely agree.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am willing to assume politics is adjourned when it is announced it is adjourned.

Mr. SLOAN. Did that apply over here on Capitol Hill or Palatine Hill, at the other end of the Avenue?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I decline to be drawn into a discussion of that. How much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used an hour and 35 minutes this time, and the Clerk informed the Chair that the gentleman had used 40 minutes the other day, whereas the Clerk now says he used 45 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. No; I used 40 minutes, which was given to Mr. MADDEN. I now yield the floor. [Applause.]

TELEPHONES IN EUROPE.

[From an address by Frank G. Odell, executive secretary National Conservation Congress, Dec. 8, 1916.]

Public ownership in theory is one thing. The actual working of public ownership is quite another thing. The future of any great and necessary public utility under public ownership can only be properly forecasted by a survey of what has actually been done where it has been tried for years. Such has been the effort of the writer. It is hoped that this paper will present new and important facts for the consideration of the reader.

SCARCITY OF RURAL TELEPHONES ABROAD.

Remarkable as it may seem, the rural telephone service of those countries which have public ownership is developed to so limited an extent that it seems to be considered unworthy of notice in the official reports of most of such countries. Great Britain is the only exception to this rule. In this country a special effort has been made for the eight years prior to the present war to extend the telephone into the country districts. This effort is consecutively noted in several recent reports of the British postmaster general under the heading, "Rural party lines—Farmers' lines."

The extent to which this effort has succeeded is shown by the total of such telephones in service at the date of the last official report (Mar. 31, 1915), namely, 2,265. This represents 1 telephone for each 4,290 of British rural population in the United Kingdom, as compared with a rural telephone in the United States of 1 for each 10 of population—or 1 telephone for each alternate family.

FARM TELEPHONES IN ENGLAND.

This remarkable development of the farm telephone in Great Britain—remarkable for its conspicuous failure to develop—is more noteworthy, because it is based on a very reasonable rate, to wit:

If the line connects three subscribers to the mile, each subscriber per year.....\$14.61
 If the line connects two subscribers to the mile, each subscriber per year.....17.05

When the efforts of the British post-office department, offering as low as this, can only secure 2,265 farmers as telephone users in eight years in all of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland there must be something wrong in the British system.

Some of these inherent defects may be found in the interminable delay in securing installation of service, such as that noted by Hon. Mr. Goldsmith of the British parliamentary telephone committee, who called attention in a parliamentary debate on this subject to the fact that nine farmer applicants in Cornwall were still waiting for their telephones after a lapse of three years from the filing of their applications.

When it is considered that the applicant for service in Great Britain must pay full rental for a year in advance, the state of mind of these Cornish farmers may be better imagined than described.

It is generally conceded that the British post office is the most efficient in the world. It should be, therefore, especially competent to work out the experiment of public ownership. The obligation to do this rests peculiarly upon the British Government for the reason that the courts of that country have decided that "A telephone is a telegraph under the telegraph acts of 1863 and 1869, although the telephone was not in existence or contemplation when those acts were passed."

The telephone system of the United Kingdom shows a deficit for the last year reported (1914-15) of \$540,657, while the deficit in telegraph operations for the seven years preceding 1914 amounts to \$30,659,444. Similar conditions as to losses in operation are to be found generally in the reports of government-ownership countries.

EUROPEAN PERCENTAGES OF DEVELOPMENT.

The rarity of rural telephones in Great Britain and continental Europe is worthy of more than passing notice. In order to make even the discouraging financial showing which is characteristic of publicly owned utilities abroad, it is necessary to develop the service in urban districts. This is indicated by the facts as to percentages of telephone development.

The city of Paris alone has 32 per cent of all the telephones in France; Vienna has 37 per cent of all the telephones in Austria; and Brussels has 37 per cent of all the telephones in Belgium. Rural development has been strangled for the sake of immediate revenue, which is in itself insufficient to develop the districts served on modern lines, so that there is complaint all along the line.

Germany prides itself on taking care of its farmers, but after a 10-year struggle for revision of telephone rates, in which the Government admitted frequently that small communities were unjustly discriminated against, all efforts proved futile and the old rates stand. Consequently the farm telephone is practically unknown in Germany, and no mention of this class of service is to be found in the official reports of that country.

Official statistics show that in the United States the rural telephone rate averages from one-third to one-half the urban rate. In foreign countries the rural rate is generally nearly as high as the urban rate. The inevitable tendency of this condition is to retard rural telephone development by making rural costs approximately city costs.

GOVERNMENT-OWNERSHIP RESTRICTIONS.

In addition to this, government-ownership countries usually impose burdensome line and service charges, still further hampering rural development. This is aptly illustrated by the following quotation from the report of the government-ownership committee of the Farmers' National Congress:

"Government restrictions on rural telephone service: Foreign telephone rate schedules, as generally quoted, do not indicate what the subscriber in rural districts actually has to pay for his telephone service. In addition to the scheduled rates there are extra charges based upon the length of the subscriber's line. In France, for example, the Government furnishes free of charge only that portion of a rural telephone line which is located within 1½ miles of the exchange.

The contribution toward the cost of construction is at the rate of \$3.86 per 110 yards of line (metallic circuit). The annual contribution toward maintenance costs is at the rate of 39 cents per 110 yards of line (metallic circuit). The scheduled rates for local (exchange) service in rural districts consist of an annual subscription, or "ready to serve," charge which allows no outward calls and a charge of 2 cents for each outward call. The annual subscription ("ready to serve") charge varies as follows:

First year.....\$19.30
 Second year.....15.44
 Third year.....11.58
 Fourth and subsequent years.....7.72

When the additional line charges are taken into consideration, it is therefore evident that in order to secure telephone service the French farmer who lives 3 miles from a telephone exchange must pay as follows:

First year, \$138.30, plus 2 cents per outward local call.
 Second year, \$26.36, plus 2 cents per outward local call.
 Third year, \$22.50, plus 2 cents per outward local call.
 Fourth and subsequent years, \$18.64, plus 2 cents per outward local call.

The rate of 2 cents per outward call by itself would appear to make the cost of rural telephone service in France prohibitive. An average of three outward calls per working day, or, say, 900 outward calls per year, entails a charge as great as the average cost of complete telephone service in the United States. Moreover, the contributions toward the cost of construction and the annual maintenance costs of subscribers' lines can not be divided among adjacent rural subscribers.

The independent form of farmers' cooperative or joint stock telephone associations, which is common in the United States, is unknown under Government ownership in Europe and is probably impossible under existing forms of governmental administration in European countries.

EXPERIENCE OF SWISS FARMERS.

In 1910 the Swiss Government made a detailed inquiry into the telephone rates of that country. While this inquiry was in progress the farmers of Switzerland thought it an opportune time to register a vigorous protest against the high line charges which the Government imposed upon them—for in Switzerland, as in France, a rural subscriber must pay extra for that portion of his line which is beyond 1½ miles from the exchange.

Acting at what appeared to be the psychological moment, the Swiss Farmers' Association earnestly requested the Government to abolish these extra line charges. In the report on the results of its rate inquiry the Government dismissed the request of the farmers' association in the following language:

"The abolition of the extra charges for the portions of subscribers' lines beyond the free radius (1½ miles from the exchange), as required by the Swiss Farmers' Association, is made impracticable by important considerations. For one thing, such a measure is quite inopportune at the present time, when the question is to add to the revenues of the telephone administration by increasing certain of the rates.

"To show the importance of the request it may be mentioned that in the year 1909 the revenue from line charges amounted to about 445,000 francs (\$89,000). If these line charges are abolished the consequent loss in revenue must be offset by a further increase in the annual subscription charges of about 15 francs (\$3). Such a large general rate increase in the interests of a relatively small number of subscribers can not be approved. One can not ask the administration to construct especially costly lines in the interest of a few subscribers unless correspondingly more revenue is received from them." (Supplementary report of the Federal council to the committee of the national council on the "Proposition to increase telephone rates," Mar. 21, 1911.)

It is not surprising, therefore, that the rural-telephone development in Switzerland is so small that it is not deemed worthy of special classification in official reports of that country.

FRANCE'S RURAL TELEPHONES.

The logical effect of burdensome regulations of this nature is aptly illustrated by a brief study of the rural telephones in France.

Like Switzerland, Germany, and other European countries, rural telephones are not specifically noted in the French reports. One may search them in vain for any clue to what is being done by the Government of France to carry the science of communication to the farmer's door.

This is not to suggest that the French Government is neglectful of the farmer, for it is not. The French farmer was borrowing money on 70 years' time at 3 and 4 per cent interest before half the American States were admitted to the Federal Union. Agriculture has been one of the greatest concerns of the French Government. One has but to reflect how her peasants paid the German war indemnity after the war of 1870 by the creation of the beet-sugar industry to understand that the Government of France is not neglectful of the farmer.

But in France, as in other European countries, the telephone, like the telegraph, is of necessity a Government monopoly, in order to have all means of rapid communication under control of the Government for military purposes. When Napoleon the Great developed the optical telegraph, he set in motion a train of militaristic influence which will never cease on the Continent until world peace is assured by the new brotherhood of man.

The writer was so fortunate as to secure access to a telephone directory of France of the year 1914, listing in one volume, about the size of the Chicago telephone directory, every telephone subscriber in the French Republic outside the exchange area of Paris. This made possible a concentrated study of rural-telephone development.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMPARISONS.

For this purpose the Department of Aisne, in northern France, was selected, having a population of nearly 520,000. This department was prior to the war the best-developed agricultural district of the Republic. Any statistical results attained from this study will, therefore, be exceedingly favorable to the French rural telephone system as a whole.

Every telephone subscriber in this district was counted and carefully tabulated, segregating those engaged in agricultural pursuits. This district was then compared with the strictly rural county of Custer, in central Nebraska, which has approximately the same geographical area. The results of this comparison are shown in the following table:

Comparison of telephone in rural districts in United States and France.

	Department of Aisne.	Custer County, Nebr.
Area in square miles.....	2,860	2,538
Population.....	518,991	25,688
Total telephones.....	44,212	4,077
Number of telephones per 100 population.....	0.81	15.88
Number farmers' telephones.....	452	2,527

Without taking into consideration the difference in population, Custer County has almost six times as many farmers' telephones as the Department of Aisne. In proportion to population, Custer County, Nebr., has nearly twenty times the number of telephones in the Department of Aisne.

The foregoing examples illustrate the way in which rural telephone development is strangled in Europe. They might be extended in the experience of practically every European country. To the student who desires to base opinion on ascertained facts these examples are a revelation of the limitations which inhere in the bureaucratic methods of Old World civilization.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, there are some important tables in the report of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent that the report (No. 849) of the committee, which is very brief, be printed in the RECORD, and also a letter from the Postmaster General in reference to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request is granted. There was no objection.

The committee report is as follows:

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, in presenting the bill making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, submits the following:

The appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, were \$361,477,577. The estimates of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, including all revisions of estimates, amount to \$368,782,577. The committee recommends appropriations to the amount of \$359,657,577.

The appropriation for aeroplane mail service has been transferred from the item "Steamboat and other power-boat service" to that of "Inland transportation by railroad routes," and by a proviso to the latter item the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding \$2,185,000 for the purchase of aeroplanes and the maintenance of aeroplane service, an increase of \$1,885,000 over the amount of \$300,000 originally estimated by the department for this service.

In the item for "Village delivery service," office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,250,000, an increase of \$530,000 over the estimate of the department.

This appropriation also covers the new provision in the bill for delivery service to communities adjacent to cities having city-delivery service.

In the item "Experimental motor-truck service," office of the Fourth Assistant, the act of June 2, 1918, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, authorized an expenditure of not exceeding \$300,000 out of any unexpended appropriations for the Postal Service, for the maintenance of motor-truck service. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for this service, an increase of \$700,000 over the estimate of the Post Office Department.

The appropriations in this bill are, of course, fixed on the basis of existing law and not on the amount of increases allowed in the last bill in addition to the regular appropriations. If the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this bill are adopted by the House, then the appropriations herein provided must be increased. To meet the requirements of these sections would add, in some instances, 15 per cent and in other instances 20 per cent of the salaries to the total appropriations. There is an increase, as shown in the bill, in the salaries of fourth-class postmasters and a 50 per cent increase in the appropriation to cover the cost of clerical service in post offices of the third class.

The salary increases herein provided for are made permanent law, and the days set aside by the President to be observed as holidays by the other departments of the Government are also made holidays within the meaning and intent of the postal laws, and postal employees performing service on such holidays will be granted either compensatory time or pay for overtime.

There is a very clear necessity for a reclassification and readjustment of the salaries of all postal employees on a just basis, and in order that the necessary information may be obtained and a proper basis recommended, the third section of this bill provides for a commission for that purpose, consisting of five Members of each House of Congress.

The report of the Postmaster General sets forth the use of the money heretofore appropriated and the revenues to be expected and expended during the coming fiscal year. It shows that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the revenues of the Post Office Department exceeded the expenditures to the amount of \$19,626,774.08 after deducting all losses.

The following tables set forth by items the appropriations for 1919, the estimates of the Post Office Department for 1920, and the committee recommendations for 1920 in the office of the Postmaster General and the four assistants, and also the total of all appropriations for the Postal Service for 1919, the estimates of the Post Office Department for 1920, and the recommendations of the committee for 1920:

Post Office appropriation bill, 1920.

	Appropriated, 1919.	Estimate for 1920.	Committee recommendation, 1920.
POSTMASTER GENERAL.			
Gas, light and power, equipment shops.....	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500
Post-office inspectors:			
Salaries.....	968,100	783,700	783,700
Per diem.....	350,000	350,000	350,000
Clerks, division headquarters.....	134,100	134,000	134,000
Traveling expenses.....	43,850	43,850	43,850
Livery hire.....	45,000	45,000	45,000
Miscellaneous expenses.....	7,500	7,500	7,500
Payment of rewards.....	25,000	25,000	25,000
Special Assistant Attorney General.....	6,000	6,000	6,000
Travel expenses, Postmaster General.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total.....	1,605,050	1,400,550	1,400,550
FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.			
Compensation to postmasters.....	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
Compensation to assistant postmasters.....	4,075,000	3,680,000	3,680,000
Clerks and employees, first and second class post offices.....	62,750,000	55,000,000	55,000,000
Compensation to printers, mechanics, etc.....	71,070	61,800	61,800
Compensation to watchmen, messengers, etc.....	1,989,500	1,912,500	1,912,500
Clerks in charge contract stations.....	1,180,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Temporary and auxiliary clerk hire.....	3,428,572	6,500,000	6,500,000
Separating mails.....	730,000	750,000	750,000
Unusual conditions.....	150,000	200,000	200,000
Allowances to third-class offices.....	2,400,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
Rent, light, and fuel, first, second, and third class post offices.....	6,500,000	7,300,000	7,300,000
Miscellaneous items, first and second class post offices.....	400,000	700,000	700,000
Letter carriers.....	49,100,000	41,000,000	41,000,000
Substitutes for letter carriers.....	4,685,715	4,685,715	4,685,715
Letter carriers, new offices.....	94,000	75,000	75,000
Vehicle allowance.....	6,700,000	9,750,000	9,750,000
Mail messenger service.....	2,700,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Car fare and bicycle allowance.....	625,000	700,000	700,000
Street car collection.....	9,000	9,000	9,000
Detroit River postal service.....	7,250	7,250	7,250
Car fare, special delivery service.....	13,000	14,000	14,000
Fees to special delivery messengers.....	3,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
Travel expenses, First Assistant Postmaster General.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total.....	185,812,107	179,543,265	179,543,265

¹ Revised estimate; original estimate, \$3,000,000.

Post Office appropriation bill, 1920—Continued.

	Appropriated, 1919.	Estimate for 1920.	Committee recommendation, 1920.
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.			
Inland transportation:			
Star routes, Alaska.....	\$430,000	\$255,000	\$255,000
Steamboats.....	1,185,000	1,185,000	1,185,000
Railroads.....	60,645,000	61,500,000	61,500,000
Freight or expressage, postal supplies.....	95,000	120,000	120,000
Railway Mail Service.....	32,500,000	28,385,500	28,385,500
Traveling expenses, railway mail clerks.....	1,613,952	1,613,952	1,613,952
Actual necessary expenses, division superintendent.....	48,000	55,297	55,297
Rent, light, etc., Railway Mail Service.....	732,158	832,158	832,158
Per diem, assistant superintendents.....	2,423	3,100	3,100
Electric and cable car service.....	555,000	545,000	545,000
Transportation of foreign mails.....	5,800,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
Censorship of foreign mails.....	1,623,000		
Balances due foreign countries.....	681,700	681,700	681,700
Travel expenses, Second Assistant Postmaster General.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total.....	105,933,235	99,877,712	99,877,712
THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.			
Manufacture adhesive postage stamps, etc.....	1,100,000	1,380,000	1,380,000
Manufacture stamped envelopes, etc.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Agent and assistants to distribute stamped envelopes.....	18,400	18,400	18,400
Manufacture postal cards.....	589,000	500,000	500,000
Ship, steamboat, and way letters.....	150	150	150
Limited indemnity:			
Domestic mails.....	670,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
International mails.....	10,000	10,000	10,000
Travel expenses:			
Third Assistant Postmaster General.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Postal Saving System.....	500	500	500
Total.....	5,380,050	6,510,050	6,510,050
FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.			
Stationery for the Postal Service.....	725,000	886,000	886,000
Postmarking, rating, and other stamps.....	275,000	375,000	375,000
Twine and tying devices.....	370,000	420,000	420,000
Miscellaneous equipment.....	400,000	480,000	480,000
Expenses, shipment of supplies.....	195,000	194,000	194,000
Miscellaneous expenses, post-route maps, etc.....	20,000	(^c)	
Canceling machines.....	405,000	337,000	337,000
Mail bags, etc.....	1,000,000	2,435,000	2,435,000
Labor, mail-bag shop.....	285,000	(^c)	
Star route transportation.....	8,675,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
Pay of rural letter carriers.....	65,800,000	65,800,000	55,445,000
Village delivery service.....	720,000	720,000	1,250,000
Experimental motor-truck service.....	(^d)	300,000	1,000,000
Travel expenses, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total.....	78,862,900	81,448,000	72,323,000
RECAPITULATION.			
Postmaster General.....	1,605,050	1,400,550	1,400,550
First Assistant Postmaster General.....	185,809,107	179,543,265	179,543,265
Second Assistant Postmaster General.....	105,933,235	99,877,712	99,877,712
Third Assistant Postmaster General.....	5,380,050	6,510,050	6,510,050
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.....	78,862,900	81,448,000	72,323,000
Total.....	361,477,577	368,782,577	359,657,577

¹ Revised estimate; original estimate, \$1,455,000.

² Revised estimate; original estimate, \$1,450,000.

³ Revised estimate; original estimate, \$880,000.

⁴ Revised estimate; original estimate, \$2,100,000.

⁵ Estimated under "Miscellaneous equipment."

⁶ Estimated under "Mail bags."

⁷ Revised estimate; original estimate, \$55,445,000.

⁸ Not exceeding \$300,000 authorized to be paid out of any unexpended appropriations for the Postal Service.

The letter referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1918.

HON. JOHN A. MOON,
Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR JUDGE MOON: I have just read a copy of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and wish to state that the bill in the form as reported by your committee has my general approval. In some instances I feel that the salaries provided are not sufficient, and in other cases are possibly too high; but inasmuch as section 3 provides for a commission to investigate the salaries of postmasters and employees with a view to their reclassification and readjustment on an equitable basis, this matter can be taken care of by the commission. In addition I wish to express to you my appreciation of the prompt action of the committee in reporting the bill and the consideration which has been given the recommendations of the department in framing it.

Very sincerely,

A. S. BURLISON,
Postmaster General.

Mr. MOON. I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the able speech of our honored chairman of

the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, Mr. Moon, of Tennessee. I think it will be generally conceded that he made a very strong argument in support of the contention that the Federal Government would have the power, so far as any constitutional objections are concerned, to purchase the telegraph and telephone companies and to operate them as a public utility.

He made a very able presentation of that phase of the question, and I doubt if any Member of the House, certainly not many of us, would take issue with him upon that proposition. But I noticed that he did not devote much of the time of his speech to a discussion of the feasibility and the practicability and the propriety of the Government going into the telegraph and telephone business. His lack of argument on that all-important phase of the subject was conspicuously absent. If I understood the argument of the gentleman from Tennessee correctly, and I think I did, because I listened to it with close attention and much interest, he espoused the cause of the Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone lines and he opposed the Government ownership of the railroad companies. In other words, the able gentleman has adopted the idea of catching us "go in' and comin'"; of arguing that the world is flat and also admitting at the same time that it may be round. Of course, if he chooses to adapt his logic to those kinds of processes I have no objection. Now, the able gentleman undertakes to argue that the telegraph facilities and the telephone facilities are necessarily a part of the Postal Service. I take issue against him on that view.

I can not see any reason why the telephone business, for example, should be classed as a postal facility. I can not see that the telephone business has any more connection with the Post Office Department than the motor truck is necessarily a part of railroad transportation or that the aeroplane is indispensably connected with steamship service. Telephone communication is an entirely different matter to communication by letter through the Postal Service, and to my mind it is an absurd contention that the two are inseparably connected with each other. And I doubt if there is very much more similarity as to the telegraph business, though I will admit that there would be greater reason for arguing the latter proposition than there would be the former, so far as abstract logic is concerned.

Now, in the discussion of this question, gentlemen, I want to pause long enough to say that I have no sympathy with the argument that is frequently made by certain gentlemen who have never builded anything themselves and who have nothing to their credit in the way of constructive achievement that the American business man is an inefficient business man. [Applause.] I submit, gentlemen, that if it had not been for the aid of the wonderful organization of American business and the magnificent accumulation of capital which American citizens have been accumulating for 140 years, the enormous sums of money necessary to carry forward our part of the war to victory could not have been raised. Indeed, we have not only been able to finance our own very heavy expenses, but we have been able to finance our allies—England, France, Belgium, Italy, and Russia—to the extent of about \$8,000,000,000, and without which they would have been unable to go on with their part of the titanic struggle. So when the historian comes to write the history of the great war he will not overlook the part which American business and American finance contributed, along with America's other splendid efforts, to its success. When these gentlemen who advocate the Government ownership of railroad, telegraph, and telephone lines point out to you the great progress the Postal Service has made—and I am glad to concede everything to which it is entitled—we can also point to the fact that America has admittedly the greatest railroad system in the world, incomparably the greatest, which has been built up by private initiative right alongside of the Postal Service under Government ownership. Indeed, when we pause to make a comparison of the two, we are compelled to admit that much of the success and efficiency of the Postal Service has been due to its use of the transportation facilities furnished by the railroads under private ownership. Those of us who pride ourselves on our excellent Postal Service, and we all do that, can also pride ourselves on the fact that the United States has the greatest telegraph and telephone system in all the world, and it has been built up under private ownership right along by the side of the Postal Service.

Why, gentlemen, we are continually being cited to some European country for the purposes of comparison to similar enterprises here. Ask gentlemen who have visited those countries, who have experienced the services of their public utilities, ask them which is the most efficient and satisfactory service. I have never heard anyone yet who has had the actual experience of using these European utilities but that admitted

our American service is the best. "The proof of the pudding is the eating thereof." Members of the House will recall that at the last session of Congress there was a bill introduced to acquire the telephone system in the District of Columbia, and the Committee on the District of Columbia submitted a report in which they purported to make certain comparisons of telegraph rates in Europe with telegraph rates in the United States. The following table was submitted:

	Distance in miles.			
	150	250	700	3,000
Europe, average.....	\$0.12	\$0.12	\$0.12	\$0.24
United States.....	.25	.30	.50	1.00

That comparison, on its face, would seem to make a good showing for European government ownership of telegraph lines, but it does not tell the whole story. It is my information that in Europe every word in the address, name, date, signature, and so forth, is charged for, as well as every word in the body of the message. I also understand that the name, address, date, and signature contain an average of 14 words in addition to the 10 words, more or less, of the body of the message. In the United States these 14 words go free. In Europe they are charged for. I submit the following table, which takes into consideration that fact:

Average charge for a domestic or intrastate telegram containing 19 text words.	
France.....	\$0.24
Norway.....	.32
Sweden.....	.32
New Zealand.....	.24
Great Britain.....	.30
Germany.....	.28
Italy.....	.25
Denmark.....	.32
Austria.....	.29
United States.....	.25 to .30

The above rate at 25 cents or 30 cents for telegrams in the United States is between two points in the same State, the distance being about the same as between two points in any of these foreign countries. When we come to telegrams in the United States for longer distances the only comparison with European rates is a comparison with telegrams in Europe between different countries, on account of the long distances traveled by the average long-distanced telegram in the United States. For instance, the United States has 3,026,789 square miles and Great Britain only 121,400 square miles, or 4 per cent of that of the United States. Here is an instance of a comparison of these long-distance telegraph messages. For example, from Paris to Vienna is about 650 miles, and the cost of a 10-word message plus the address and signature, charged for, is 96 cents, as against only 40 cents, address and signature free, for a similar distance in the United States. From Stockholm to Paris, 1,000 miles, the rate for a 10-word message, the address and signature charged for, is \$1.20. From New York to Chicago, about the same distance, the rate for a 10-word message, address and signature free, is 50 cents. There are many other advantages of the telegraph system in the United States which I might mention. Our telegraph companies here in this country send messengers to collect telegrams, keep open accounts for their customers, keep offices in hotels, apartment houses, and in many other ways offer competitive accommodations to their customers. It is my information that in European countries where the Government owns the telegraph lines they do nothing of the kind. I submit these figures and comparisons upon the basis of a statement issued by Mr. Edward Reynolds, vice president and general manager of the Postal Telegraph Cable Co., on April 16, 1918. I have never heard their accuracy challenged by anyone and I assume that they are correct.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Has the gentleman any table to show the comparative time it takes to send a message in those comparative areas in the different countries? For instance, the one from Paris to Vienna, and the comparison with the same distance in this country?

Mr. BLACK. I am sorry that I can not give the information to the gentleman, though it has always been my understanding that the telegraph and telephone service in the United States is much more prompt and expeditious.

Mr. SNYDER. I wanted to know if you had had any experience abroad in sending a message. I wish to say that it will take at least five times as long to get a message through

there the same distance as it does here, and that is also true of the telephone. There is absolutely no practical comparison in any system between any country in which I have tried to send a message with this country here. We are always ahead of them in every direction.

Mr. BLACK. I take pride in the belief that the American business man is the leading business man in the world, that the American farmer is the best farmer in the world, that the American laborer is the most reliable and independent in the world, as I believe the American Republic is the best Government in the world. [Applause.]

Now, what I have said, gentlemen, is somewhat preliminary to the speech that I had intended to make.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILROAD, TELEGRAPH, AND TELEPHONE LINES.

Mr. Chairman, there is a recommendation in the Postmaster General's report which urges Government ownership of telegraph and telephone lines, and Chairman Moon, of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, introduced a bill yesterday in line with the Postmaster General's recommendation. This is not a new recommendation, but is one which has been made several times before by our present Postmaster General. It is only given new and added interest at this time by reason of the fact that the control of telegraph and telephone lines has been taken over by the Government under a belief of war necessity, and these lines are now being operated under such Government control.

In the limited time which I have at my disposal it would be impossible for me to venture upon a comprehensive discussion of the question of the Government ownership of railroads or the telegraph and telephone lines. I do want to say, however, that I have seen nothing in the Government operation of either the railroads or the telegraph and telephone lines which would cause me in the least to modify my opposition to the Government ownership of either. On the contrary, I am more firmly convinced than ever that the policy would be unwise and the most dangerous sort of a governmental venture.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman give in his admirable address there the date when the cables were taken over, and also the date when the telegraph and telephone lines were taken over?

Mr. BLACK. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. SNYDER. In making my remark a moment ago, I had reference to the handling of the business by telegraph and telephone companies previous to the war.

Mr. BLACK. Yes. I think we all admit that the American telegraph and telephone service is more efficient and more expeditious than that of any European country. I think that is conceded by those who have had the actual opportunity to use both of them and compare their services. As I was stating when diverted by the questions, I believe this policy of Government ownership of railroads, telegraphs, and so forth, would be dangerous from a business and economical standpoint as well as to the genius of our political institutions. Unified operation of the railroads, it is true, under Government ownership will bring a saving in so far as that one particular feature of the matter is concerned, and perhaps it would do so as to telephone and telegraph lines. Theoretically, at least, the same public services can be performed in that way at less cost. There has never been any serious dispute about some economies being possible under unified control and management. Many of the most able railroad men of the country have fully realized the potency of that fact and have sought to put their ideas into execution, but they were restrained by the Sherman antitrust law and other legislative restrictions and were unable to effect this unification with its consequent economy and better service.

But under long-continued Government management, whatever is gained through unified operation in the first place will presently be lost because Government management in itself is unquestionably more expensive than private management. The roads will suffer that gradual hardening of the arteries which is inseparable from Government work; pay rolls will increase—they have increased enormously already as to railroads; initiative will decrease; red tape will grow under continued Government management; the gains incident to unified management and control will disappear. In fact, they have already made their exit, and the operating expenses of the railroads are now immeasurably greater than they were under private management, and have much more than wiped out any gains which have been made by reason of unified operation.

Therefore, I say that I have seen no magic in Government operation and control of railroads and telegraph and telephone

companies which would cause me to reverse my lifetime views on that subject. And I do not favor the extension of the Government operation of them any longer than the present law provides. If the time of Government operation of the railroads, for example, is extended to a period of five years, as has been suggested by Director General McAdoo in his letter to Chairman SUMMERS of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, then, judging the future by the past, at the end of that five years the railroads would be burdened with such an enormous increase in annual fixed charges that it would be utterly impossible to return to private ownership, because the public would never permit the railroad companies under private ownership to collect the high freight and passenger rates which it would be absolutely necessary to collect in order to meet these enormous additional fixed charges.

A five-year régime of Government control and operation will mean inevitable Government ownership, not because of any demonstration of greater economy or efficiency, but because of a burden of additional fixed charges and multiplied red tape and financial hardening of the arteries that will make return to private ownership impossible. Mr. G. H. Sines, chairman of the board of railroad wages and working conditions of the United States Railroad Administration, said in a recent speech before the labor reconstruction conference, Academy of Political Science, New York City, that, due to the general order of the Director General of Railroads issued May 25, this year, that the wages of railroad employees were first increased \$300,000,000 per annum and that since then, in a period of less than six months, five subsequent general supplemental orders have been issued, which brings this increase up to \$250,000,000 more annually, and that there are 650,000 employees who will be included in other orders which will be issued in the near future. He does not state how many millions of dollars more this order which is now pending will add to the \$550,000,000 per annum which has already been fixed.

I want to pause just at this point and state briefly my views with reference to the enormous sums which have been paid out under orders of the Director General to railway employees as back pay. In settlement of wage advances which were made retroactive in their operation, I was astounded at some of the figures which I had read in the papers on this subject, and so, for purposes of verification, I requested the Director General to furnish me with accurate data as to this particular matter, and I will ask the clerk to read in my time a letter which I have received from Hon. Charles A. Prouty, director of the Division of Public Service and Accounting of the United States Railroad Administration, which gives the information, in part, which I sought:

DECEMBER 9, 1918.

HON. EUGENE BLACK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Yours of November 29, 1918, addressed to the Director General, has been referred to me.

The amount of back wages by class I railroads—that is, railroads with an annual income of \$1,000,000 or more, most of whom are under Federal control—for the first five months of the calendar year was \$230,731,277.

Some other amounts have been paid and will be paid by reason of the retroactive effect of wages, but I can not give you any accurate figures in addition to the above.

Very truly, yours,

C. A. PROUTY, Director.

I do not question the action of the Director General for the wage increases which were given to the railway employees in so far as they would apply from the time the awards were made. These increases were undoubtedly liberal and generous, and there may be some question if they were not too much in some cases of the higher salaried employees; but be that as it may, I do question the justice to the American tax-paying public of the Director General's order making these wage increases retroactive in their effect and paying the enormous sum of \$230,731,277 in the form of back pay. I think the people may well demand some explanation of that unprecedented action. [Applause.] Suppose when we passed the Post Office appropriation bill in the month of June, at the last session of Congress, in which we gave salary increases to postal employees which were to date from July 1, 1918, that we had proposed to make these increases retroactive and go back and pay such increases from January 1, 1918. What would have been the verdict of the public as to such procedure? And yet that kind of legislation on the part of Congress would have only cost the public a few million dollars, whereas Mr. McAdoo's retroactive wage increases cost \$230,731,277 in the first five months of the year, which the American public will have to pay, because certainly no one will dispute that ultimately Jones pays the freight.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Two or three days ago I noticed in the Washington Evening Star—and I presume the gentleman noticed it—the statement that should the Government continue the control of railroads five years longer the pay of the railroad employees would not be diminished. I would like to know whether the gentleman has any explanation of the purpose, or knows the purpose, in making such a statement in the paper. It purports to come from the Director General's office. I can produce the paper.

Mr. BLACK. I will say to the gentleman that if I correctly interpreted the statement of Mr. G. H. Sines, chairman of the board of railroad wages and working conditions, the public need not expect any readjustment of these wage increases, notwithstanding there may be a substantial decline in the values of most everything else.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Could the gentleman explain the purpose of that statement?

Mr. BLACK. Of course, I would not attempt to interpret the statement of the purpose of another gentleman. I can only give his statement as it was made, and Members can have their own opinion as to the wisdom or unwisdom of it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They might be decreased or they might be increased.

Mr. BLACK. I presume that the gentleman means that in the period that is immediately ahead of us, that there might arise good reasons for further increases or, on the contrary, a decline in values and falling off of business might make some decreases imperative. I agree with you.

Mr. SLOAN. To meet that large expenditure for back wages, and so on, was that met by increased freight collections, or was it also met in part by money which this Government loaned through its War Finance Corporation to the railroads?

Mr. BLACK. I presume it was met by the freight increases that were added since the Government took control. I can imagine that the feeling of some of the employees when they got their checks for back pay, some of them amounting to considerable sums, was somewhat akin to the feeling of one Ezekiel Cornstassel, a North Carolina mountaineer, who celebrated an Easter Monday by going for the first time in his life to a horse race. It was a new experience to him, and his companions easily persuaded him to stake in the third race a dollar on a sixty-to-one shot. Contrary to all expectation on the part of the bookmakers, Zeke's horse won, and when the bookmaker handed over to him \$61, he said, "Do you mean to tell me that I get all this money for one dollar?" "That's what you do," said the bookmaker. Zeke's eyes looked like Sinbad's in the valley of diamonds, and he muttered to himself, "By gosh, I wonder how long this thing has been goin' on, and just to think I never knowed it before."

No doubt many of the railroad employees when they received their checks for their part of this \$230,731,277 back pay, wondered why the idea of Government operation and control had not been thought of long ago. Men usually do not forget their own interests. Human nature is very much the same the world over among all of us, and in view of this very generous and liberal treatment which the employees have received under Government operation and control, it is perfectly natural that they should advocate Government ownership.

The general public, however, who have been called upon to pay 25 per cent increase in freight rates and 50 per cent increase in passenger rates will probably not be so enthusiastic over the proposition, and will no doubt be somewhat more critical in their attitude and will ask to be "shown."

Now, I will not attempt to go exhaustively into the reasons why I do not advocate this Government-ownership idea—why I favor the principles of individual initiative under proper Government supervision and regulation rather than an experiment in State socialism—but this one other thing I want to say, and that is: Government ownership of great business enterprises like the railroad and telegraph and telephone companies would have an unfair advantage over the private business of the country in this way: When periods of reduced business activity come and things are dull, private business must adjust itself to the changed conditions, effect business economies, reduce overhead expenses, and thus meet the exigencies of the situation and cope with it until the time of depression is passed. It must do these things or else go into bankruptcy.

But not so with the Government. When times are dull and business reduced, it does not, as a usual thing, reduce expenses and effect economies. It meets the situation by making taxation rates higher, which, in the event we had Government ownership of railroads, would be reflected either in higher freight and passenger rates or else the deficit would be made up by general taxation.

Do you suppose that 2,000,000 men on the Government pay roll under Government ownership of railroad, telegraph, and

telephone lines, closely organized and operating under our system of political control, would ever consent to any reduction in wages, regardless of how imperative the need might be? There is, however, one class which is never organized, except spasmodically and temporarily, to influence government in its behalf. This is the taxpayers. It is the largest class of all; but a small body of voters, having a single common interest which it has organized itself to promote, often exert more influence on government than a large class whose members do not clearly recognize their common interest and organize especially to promote it. Therefore the class which under Government ownership is least likely to be protected is the taxpayers. In the legislative consideration of this great question we certainly should not leave them out of the equation.

It is not for the railroad, telegraph, or telephone companies that I speak, because under Government ownership they would not suffer. The Constitution guarantees them against taking their property for public use without just compensation, and everybody will admit that the Government generally pays enough for what it gets. No; it is not for them that I speak. Those that I want to speak for, when this great question comes up for settlement, is the body of unorganized taxpayers, the general public, who, while they rarely ask for any special consideration, have a right to expect their Representatives in Congress to see to it that their interests are not overlooked and that they receive a square deal. [Applause.]

I confidently believe the American Congress will be equal to the task, that the rights of the public will be protected, and that Government ownership will not be fastened upon the country under the guise of war necessity.

Now, I recognize that before the railroads are turned back to their owners that it will probably be wise to enact some additional legislation for their regulation and control. Personally I think that Federal incorporation of all interstate railroads will probably be found to be a wise policy to adopt, with provisions that the capital stock of any such incorporation shall not exceed the actual cash paid in or value of the property after deducting the amount of its bonded indebtedness. I advocate the broadening and extension of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, so that the securities issued by interstate railroads thus incorporated under Federal charter would be under strict Government supervision and control. This idea would carry into effect a bill introduced in the Sixty-third Congress by my colleague, Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas; also that proper pooling agreements between different systems be allowed, subject to approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think that it would also probably be wise to create a commission, with power to decide questions of wages, hours of labor, and conditions of employment as they may arise between the railroad companies and their employees, and that the membership of this commission should be composed of an equal number of those representing owners and stockholders of the railroads, the employees, and the general public.

These brief suggestions I make at this time as matters worthy of consideration from the standpoint of legislative treatment of the subject, so far as the railroads are concerned. I do not know that any immediate legislation is necessary at all so far as the telegraph and telephone companies are concerned before they are turned back to their owners. To say the least of it, that is a subject which Congress can take up in the regular and orderly way, and I know of nothing which would seem to demand any precipitate haste.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 31 minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say with reference to the question of Government ownership of railroads and telegraph and telephone lines.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. My memory does not retain the statement of the length of time for which the back pay was given.

Mr. BLACK. The \$230,731,277 was for the first five months of the year.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wanted to make that inquiry in order to be sure.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In that connection, if the gentleman will pardon me, was there not some understanding that there was a controversy as to the amount these railroad employees should be paid, and was not that submitted to some board of arbitration or conciliation to determine the just amount, and was there not an agreement at that time that the award should go back to the time when the question arose?

Mr. BLACK. There was no board of arbitration or conciliation, but when Director General McAdoo took charge he appointed a railroad wage commission, composed, I believe, of

Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Charles C. McChord, J. Harry Covington, and William R. Willcox, and after receiving their report Mr. McAdoo issued his General Order No. 27, putting the salary increases into effect. The point that I desire to stress is that in governmental enterprises salary increases should be dated from the date that the award is made, unless there is an unusual reason for it to be otherwise. Take the instance I gave as to the increase of salaries to postal employees. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, of course, spent a considerable time in investigating the merits of their claims, and we determined that they were entitled to some increases, and we passed a bill giving them such increases, not so generous perhaps as were awarded to the railroad employees, and yet we did not undertake to make them retroactive. We dated it from July 1, 1918. I think that the claim of postal employees for retroactive wage increases would have rested on as good ground as that of railroad employees.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But the gentleman would easily understand that there would be more justification under the circumstances of an agreement than if it were merely an arbitrary action?

Mr. BLACK. Yes. If indeed there was any such agreement of that kind, although I do not defend the agreement, if there was, because I do not think it was a just matter to the American public to give this \$230,731,277 of back pay, unless there was a much better reason for it than any which I have thus far seen advanced.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1920.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office appropriation bill which we now have under consideration is for the fiscal year of 1920, which begins July 1, 1919, and ends June 30, 1920. The bill which we passed at the recent session of Congress was for the fiscal year 1919, and the latest report of the Postmaster General, which was released only a few days ago and which is now available for reference and study, is for the fiscal year 1918, which ended June 30, 1918. That report will furnish profitable information to any Member who will take the time to read it.

To my way of thinking there are some very good reasons why the receipts and disbursements of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1918, as disclosed by the report of the Postmaster General, should be carefully studied in comparison with the probable receipts for the fiscal year 1920, and the appropriations for expenditures carried in this bill for such fiscal year of 1920.

A recital of facts and figures of this kind is, of course, dry and uninteresting from some points of view, and yet information of such nature is necessary in determining the wisdom or unwisdom of certain legislative provisions carried in this bill and certain legislative proposals now pending in the Senate in what is known as the war revenue bill. I think I will be able to conclusively demonstrate that if the permanent salary increases to postal employees which are carried in section 2 of the bill which we now have under consideration are adopted and the increases in postage on first and second class mail matter which were provided in the war revenue bill of 1917 are repealed, then such action will inevitably and to a mathematical certainty create a large deficit annually in the Post Office Department. If this fact be true, and I think I will be able to establish that it is, then the question squarely presents itself: Do we want the Post Office Department operated upon a self-sustaining basis, or do we want it conducted at a heavy annual loss?

I am not one of those who believe that the Post Office Department should be operated as a source of profit to the Federal Government or as a money-making institution, but I do believe that it should be made to pay its own way, and that it is the duty of Congress to lend every encouragement to the Postmaster General to enable him to accomplish that result. I would not any more advocate that the Postal Service be operated at a loss than I would advocate that the railroad companies, the express companies, the telegraph and telephone companies be operated at a loss.

I hold that it is fundamental that any unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation, and that if the railroad companies or the express companies or the telegraph or the telephone companies were operated at rates and charges while under Government control which would cause a large deficit to pile up that any tax on the general public to make up such a deficit would be an unjust tax, because it would be in its very nature an unnecessary tax—unnecessary because the rates should be made adequate to meet the fixed charges.

Director General McAdoo has recognized and has taken into consideration the soundness of this view and early in the period of Government control issued a general order increasing freight rates approximately 25 per cent and passenger rates approximately 50 per cent. These increased freight and passenger

rates were made necessary by increased operating expenses, which I have already discussed.

I am not passing upon the correctness of all these increased operating expenses, but what I do affirm with entire confidence is this: When these increased operating expenses were added the way to provide to meet them was by increased freight and passenger rates rather than general taxation. For in that way Jones pays the freight, rather than Jones and Smith by taxation, when maybe Smith does not have any freight to haul and stays at home and does not ride the passenger trains or the Pullman cars.

Another advantage of that method is this: When you increase these operating costs, such as increases in wages and other overhead charges, and thereby increase the rates which the public has to pay, that same public will sooner or later begin to inquire as to the reasonableness and justness of such increases and will ask to be shown why they were made. This fact will serve as a check on wasteful and extravagant expenditures, whereas, if such increases while under Government control should be allowed to pile up as a deficit and be met by general taxation, levied to meet thousands of other expenditures of the various and sundry departments of the Government, this wholesome check will not be had, and the usual invitation to extravagant and wasteful expenditures will obtain.

Therefore, I am emphatically in favor of the Post Office Department being operated upon a self-sustaining basis, both now and hereafter, and I think that the present Postmaster General deserves the thanks and commendation of the American people for having operated the Post Office Department upon something more than a self-sustaining basis during each and every year since he has been in office except one, that being the fiscal year 1915, when the European war broke out and which fiscal year began July 1, 1914.

The audited postal surplus of the Post Office Department since Postmaster General Burleson has been in office, for the several different years, is as follows:

1914	\$4,376,463.05
1916	5,829,236.07
1917	9,836,211.90
1918	19,626,774.08
1915 (deficit)	39,668,685.10
	11,333,308.97
Total net surplus to June 30, 1918	28,335,376.13

Without any desire to be partisan or to criticize the policy and administration of any other Postmaster General who has served our Nation in the past, I challenge the showing of a better record than this of Mr. Burleson in the history of the Postal Service. Of course I very well understand that he has been the target of some criticism, some of it bitter, and much of it, as I think, unjust and without cause, but despite all criticism and fault-finding the fact remains that he and his able assistants and the thousands of loyal and efficient postmasters and postal employees who have served under him have moved steadily forward and are to-day operating the Postal Service more efficiently than at any time in the history of the Government, especially when the difficulties and unusual conditions of the war period are taken into consideration.

I said awhile ago that if the salary increases provided in section 2 of this bill are adopted, and the increased postage on first and second class mail heretofore provided in the war-revenue bill is repealed, then an analysis of the estimated receipts of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1920, taken in connection with the appropriations carried in this bill, will be bound to point out to us a large deficit in the postal revenues for the fiscal year 1920. And I think that is a subject well worthy of our thought and consideration.

Having made that statement, I will now undertake to demonstrate it: The total postal receipts for the fiscal year 1918, which ended June 30 last, were \$388,975,962.24, and of this amount \$44,500,000 was increased postage collected under the terms of the war-revenue bill from November 2, 1917, to June 30, 1918, and has been paid into the Treasury of the United States by the Postmaster General in the manner prescribed by the act of Congress which directed its collection.

This leaves \$344,475,962.24 as general postal revenues collected under the normal postal rates for the fiscal year 1918, and, as I have stated, shows a surplus of \$19,626,774.08, after deducting all expenditures, but it must be remembered that the recent salary increases of postal employees did not go into effect until July 1, 1918, and therefore are not reflected in the figures for the fiscal year 1918.

That these increases will have a considerable reflection in the fiscal years 1919 and 1920 there need be no doubt, and it is that feature of the matter that I now want to discuss in some detail.

The total receipts of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1918, figures of which I have already given, exclusive of the war-revenue portion, was an increase of 4.47 per cent over the receipts of 1917, and if this same percentage of increase continues for the fiscal years 1919 and 1920, then the receipts will be approximately \$375,000,000 for the fiscal year 1920.

Under no stretch of reasonable imagination or intelligent forecast, based on the law of general averages which has governed in the past, can we reasonably expect that the postal revenues for the fiscal year 1920, assuming that the 3-cent letter postage and zone rates on second-class matter are repealed, will be greater than \$375,000,000.

I want to call special attention to that, gentlemen, because in the consideration of this bill we must face the facts as they are. I repeat that under no stretch of reasonable imagination or intelligent forecast, based on the law of general averages which has governed in the past, can we reasonably expect that the postal revenues for the fiscal year 1920, assuming that the 3-cent letter postage and zone rates on second-class matter are repealed, there will be greater than \$375,000,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Let me finish the statement, and then I will yield.

Now, the appropriations carried in the bill which we now have under consideration total \$359,657,577, and if we adopt section 2 of the bill, which provides these permanent salary increases to postal employees, then at least \$40,000,000 more will have to be added to the total of the bill, either here or in the Senate, which will swell the total of the appropriations carried in it to more than \$400,000,000.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. MOON. The estimate of the Post Office Department for the increase of salaries under section 2 and the carriers under section 1 totals \$34,000,000.

Mr. BLACK. I called up Mr. Koons, if the gentleman will permit, the First Assistant Postmaster General, and he states that his first estimate was based on the idea of the suspension of automatic promotions. But inasmuch as the bill provides for the automatic promotions, it will take more than \$40,000,000.

Mr. MOON. I think you can take that letter for it.

Mr. BLACK. I submit to the gentleman from Tennessee that the figure of \$40,000,000 additional amount to be added to the appropriations already carried in the bill is correct, and that he will find it so.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Can the gentleman state what the loss will be by reason of the repeal of the zone rates?

Mr. BLACK. Those rates are of ascending costs. It is so framed that in the fourth year it would reach its peak of revenue, and would yield at that time between \$30,000,000 and \$40,000,000, I believe, depending, of course, upon the amount of second-class mail matter then carried in the mails.

I hope that gentlemen will not think that I am indulging in speculative matters of imagination or fine-spun fancies of theory. I am giving you statements of fact, which you can verify yourselves, if you will take the trouble to do so. First Assistant Postmaster General Koons has stated to me authoritatively that the adoption of section 2 of the bill will add something more than \$40,000,000 to the expenses of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1920.

I suppose no one who is posted on the effect of the section, and has figured it out for himself, will dispute the accuracy of Mr. Koons's statement. Therefore, assuming that the average increases in postal receipts which have obtained during the war period continue for the fiscal year 1920, then the total receipts for that year will be, as I have stated, \$375,000,000, or \$25,000,000 less than the expenditures which we are now proposing to authorize and direct in this bill.

WAR INFLATION CAN NOT BE KEPT UP—WAR CONDITIONS WILL PASS.

But can we expect the average increase in postal receipts to continue after the war? I think not. We all very well understand that the country has been passing through a period of war inflation and unexampled prosperity in many lines, and this prosperity has been reflected in the postal receipts for the last four years, and while I do not want to be understood as making any gloomy predictions for the future, still I think it would be very unwise for us to base our calculations on the assumption that this war inflation will continue now that the war has ended. If it should continue, then one thing is very certain; it will inevitably wreck the finances of the country and bring industrial anarchy and chaos to our people. No nation, it matters not how rich it may be, can go on continually piling up a huge bonded indebtedness and an unending inflation of its paper currency.

There must inevitably come a day of liquidation and no amount of foolish argument or specious pleas can avoid it. Those of Bolsheviki tendencies can pass all the resolutions they please, and make fervid and lurid speeches, but no amount of such trash and bombast can ever bring prosperity to any country or solve its problems of reconstruction and readjustment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Can the gentleman yield me 10 minutes more?

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. BLACK. I read in a paper not long ago where one of these fervid Bolsheviki orators was making a speech and said: "Work after the war. Nonsense; there ought to be no work after war. Do they call that making the world safe for democracy?" It takes the great wheels of industry in the mine and factory, on the farm, and in the marts of trade, going round and round, to bring happiness and peace and prosperity to the people, and these wheels of industry must be adjusted to conditions as they are and not what a lot of dreamers and theorists would interpret them to be.

So, gentlemen, the country had just as well prepare itself for an era of some decline in prices, not too radical, I hope, and gradual in its processes, but which is bound to come, and which will be reflected in the selling prices of manufactured articles, farm products, transportation, and wages of labor. The more uniform and just in proportion this decline can be effected the less will be the disturbance to the social and industrial fabric of the Nation.

The real task of statesmanship, of those in public authority, of those in positions of business and financial responsibility, of those high in the councils of labor, is to see that the decline does fall in just and uniform proportion, and that no one interest, or class, or group is protected against this inevitable decline and shrinkage of values at the expense of the other.

Already certain interests and groups are issuing defies that they will not stand for any readjustment; that they will resist to the bitter end any curtailment of their particular interests. "Reduce the compensation of others," they say. "Let the farmer's product decline; let everything else meet the test of changing conditions; but, as for us, keep your hands off. We are going to hold what we have got."

Suppose that all business and agricultural and industrial enterprises assume the attitude that they will stand for no readjustment in prices under changed conditions. Suppose the manufacturer says that he must get the same price for his product which he has been receiving during the period of war inflation, and that if he does not, then he will close up his factory and quit. Suppose the farmer insists that he must continue to sell his corn and his cotton and his wheat and his hogs and his cattle at prices which have prevailed during the war, when millions of men have been under arms and out of the avenues of production, or else he will cease to produce and will allow the grass, the bramble, and the thorn to grow where once waved the broad acres of corn and wheat and blossomed the snowy fields of cotton. Suppose the laborer in the mine and factory and at the forge and furnace refuses to go on with his work unless some of the unusual rates of pay which have prevailed during the war are continued. What will be the result? The answer is very simple. Industrial anarchy and chaos will be inevitable. Bolshevism, if you please, will stalk abroad to point its bony fingers at a once happy and prosperous people.

But I do not take the pessimistic view that such a condition will prevail. Our people understand too well the value of co-operation with one another for a condition like that to be allowed to obtain to any very large extent. The radicals, whether in the business world or in industry or agriculture or labor or wherever they may be, will not be permitted to prevail in their radical, destructive ideas; but, on the contrary, the American spirit of justice and fair play will dominate. It is bound to dominate. It has dominated this Government for 140 years and has made our great Republic what it is to-day, and I am not afraid that we will desert our cherished principles and traditions. One very eminent American public man said in a speech not very long ago that the test of the civilization of any people is their ability to cooperate, and I think that statement is undoubtedly true, and I hope that the spirit of the American people will be able to meet this test in dealing with the complex problems which are immediately ahead of us in the months that are to come. I have confidence to believe that they will adequately meet the test, not without some blunders and mistakes—no; because human intelligence and human motives are not free from error. But all in all, by and large, we will come through these difficulties safe and sane, as we have often emerged before. [Applause.]

In the period that is ahead of us capital must realize that it must be content with smaller dividends and be willing to make a liberal and just division with labor. Labor, on its part, must

realize that the great factories, engines, forges, and furnaces are useless and but a pile of steel, mortar, and stone without capital and the power of a directing genius to operate them. All sides must realize that the spirit of justice and fair play is far more fruitful in its ultimate results than a spirit of prejudice and hate.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL AGAIN.

But I will return from this digression. What I was talking about at the time of the digression was the prospective deficit of at least \$25,000,000 in the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1920. And now, having given the figures as to that matter, I will naturally be asked the question as to what will be my attitude as to how to meet the deficit. I do want to emphasize my emphatic advocacy of the policy that the Post Office Department should be self-sustaining in its operations, and be allowed to protect against the creation of a deficit, and that is the purpose of this part of my remarks. I have pointed out this impending deficit with the view that we should have these facts in mind when the proposition is made to repeal the zone postal law and the 3-cent letter postage. We must retain one or the other of these and maybe both. I further call your attention to the fact that these permanent salary increases which we are about to pass are of ascending costs on account of the automatic promotion law, and in 1921 will cost at least \$50,000,000 more than present law and in 1922 at least \$55,000,000 more than at present. In 1922 the increases will reach their peak of cost.

So it looks to me like the zone postal rates on second-class matter have come to stay, unless we are to adopt the policy of operating the Post Office Department at a large annual deficit and making up this deficit by general taxation. Surely we will not resort to so unwise a policy as that, and I certainly want to register my protest against any such idea as that. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD a statement from Gen. Koons, First Assistant Postmaster General, showing additional expenditures on account of salaries for 1919 over 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, Washington, December 11, 1918.

Hon. JOHN A. MOON,
Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR JUDGE MOON: In accordance with your telephonic request, I am handing you herewith a memorandum showing the additional amounts which were required to cover salaries in the Postal Service for 1919 over 1918.

Sincerely, yours,

J. C. KOONS,
First Assistant Postmaster General.

WASHINGTON, December 9, 1918.

Additional expenditures on account of salary for 1919 over 1918.

Clerks, first and second class offices	\$8,530,110
Assistant postmasters, first and second class offices	510,700
Watchmen, messengers, and laborers	234,360
Printers, mechanics, and skilled laborers	7,980
City letter carriers	6,907,800
Pay of substitute employees at 40 cents an hour instead of 35 cents:	
Substitute clerks	428,700
Substitute carriers	585,700
Motor-vehicle service: Superintendents, mechanics, chauffeurs, garage men	182,000
Railway Mail Service: Salaries	4,706,887
Rural Mail Service:	
Increase in salary, per annum rate	10,130,332
Additional mileage provision	2,423,472
Salaries of post-office inspectors, inspectors in charge, and employees at division headquarters	90,750
	34,738,791

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Minnesota will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, upon another occasion I had something to say about the wretched Postal Service, particularly between the people in this country and the boys at the front. But I want to take advantage of this general debate this afternoon to say just a word in regard to the inefficient service being rendered by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. The subject has been dealt with by a number of other Members, but I desire to present some further facts that may be of interest to the membership of the House.

In common with every Member of this House, I have been deluged with complaints from parents and wives at home stating

that they have not got their allotments and allowances. While at the beginning, when the Bureau of War Risk Insurance was being organized, there were excusable delays, many of us had hoped that at the end of a year or more these annoying delays and instances of neglect would be remedied. Congress quickly responded to every request for appropriations of money amply sufficient to make this service efficient in every respect. But still complaints came in in increasing numbers. Just before the election, when I went home at the time of the recess of Congress, I had not been home 24 hours when I was called upon by two different women, who said they had not received a single cent of their allotments for nine months, and I have since had a great many similar cases. In most cases there does not seem to be any excuse whatever for the delay and neglect.

One of the most outrageous cases that came to my attention was that of a sailor boy who had been 18 months upon a vessel in the North Sea and was given 30 days' leave of absence in this country independent of and in addition to the time taken in coming and going. He had made an allotment to his wife 12 months before, and for 12 months the money had been taken out of his pay. When he reached Cambridge and went to see his family he found that they had not received one single cent and were obliged to depend for their support on the generosity of friends and neighbors. There are hundreds and thousands—yes, tens of thousands—of cases where these boys have gone over to fight the battles of their country thinking that the folks at home are being taken care of by a generous Government. And they are not being taken care of. And what are the soldier boys going to do when they come home and find that their families have been thus neglected? In my opinion they are going to hold the officials responsible for this inexcusable inefficiency to a strict account for what their dear ones have needlessly suffered.

Worse than that, after we Members of Congress take these cases up, and after months of delay the thing is straightened out and the families begin to receive the money, after a month or two it frequently happens that the same thing happens again.

Now, there is one other matter, Mr. Chairman, which I wish to call to the attention of the committee in connection with this matter. With the money that we have appropriated for the use of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance for the carrying out of this necessary work there have been put upon the pay roll hundreds of men as inspectors and field investigators, and they have been making secret reports to Washington, and on the basis of those reports allowances are being taken away from dependent families. While I have no objection to the legitimate work of these investigators in unearthing fraud, I have three cases that I want particularly to bring to your attention to show what is actually being done under the guise of protecting the Government.

There are two women in the city of Cambridge, one of whom has five boys in the service and one of whom has four. In time of peace, before this war commenced, each one of the boys in both these families brought all his wages home to his mother, and they were able to get along comfortably. In each of these cases the mother has been notified that all the Government allowances have been taken away, and that she must refund to the Government a sum of money equal to all allowances received by her. Why? These women are sisters, and it seems that they each own the equity in the house occupied by the family. I presume that these inspectors found from the records of the assessors of the city of Cambridge that there was a house assessed to each of these women. As a matter of fact the houses are heavily mortgaged, and yet on the strength of the assessment, on the ground that these mothers were not absolutely dependent upon the wages of these boys, the allowance has been taken away in both cases.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not understand what difference that can make under the law—the fact that the woman has a house. Can the gentleman explain?

Mr. DALLINGER. I simply know that the reason given by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is that the mothers were not entirely dependent upon the boys and therefore not entitled to the allowance.

Mr. REYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. No; I have not the time.

Mr. REYBURN. The inspector has to do whatever the law requires in the case.

Mr. DALLINGER. Now, here is another case: An old man, unable to work, sick a good deal of the time, has a daughter who is also an invalid, who keeps house for him. He has three boys in the service, who before the war paid their wages to the father each week. The fourth boy, his only remaining dependence, was drafted just before the war ceased. One of the boys married just before he went into the Army, and the second one married after he got to France. That left one boy in the serv-

ice who made an allotment to the father. Now, they found that the old gentleman had a house and land, which was assessed for the large sum of \$1,200. On the strength of that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance took away his allowance. I say, Mr. Chairman, that such an interpretation of the law on the part of the War Risk Insurance Bureau was never contemplated by Congress. Of course, where a family had plenty of money and were not in any way dependent upon the wages of the soldier it is all right and appropriate that the Government should not add an allowance to the allotment; but where in cases of this kind, with a heavily mortgaged home or real property bringing in no income and where the boys in time of peace contributed all their wages to the support of the aged parents, I say it is outrageous to take away the allowance that Congress provided.

In my opinion there is no excuse whatever in most of these cases for the delays in the allotment and allowances. I find, however, that the same delay exists in regard to soldiers' pay. I found boys last spring in the Walter Reed Hospital that had not received any pay for months. The other day it came to the attention of the Committee on Education, in hearings on the rehabilitation act, that in all the big cities boys in uniform were begging on the streets because they had received no pay. I have case after case in my district where not only the boy has had no pay since he has been in the Army, but the family has received no allotment or allowance. Thousands of these families have to be supported by charity because of the inexcusable inefficiency and incompetency of this kind of administration of the executive branch of the Government, which is a disgrace to the Government of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE].

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, like my colleague who has just taken his seat, I have had some unpleasant experiences with the War Risk and Allotments Bureaus of the War Department. I could repeat many cases similar to those just stated to the House. There seems to be no reason why these conditions should exist. I can readily see how a delay of a month, or perhaps for two months, might happen; but when the delays runs on for 12 months, 14 months, 15 months, and these boys are without their salaries, families without allotments, with all the men in uniform around these streets, there must be something wrong to cause such a condition.

But that, too, applies, Mr. Chairman, to the department for which we are now considering appropriations. In all my experience I have never had so many people come to me with complaints of the condition of the mail service. I can readily see, too, that there may be a reason that the deplorable condition of the service is, in some measure, because of the lack of help. I can readily see that this department may have been affected as much, if not more, than any other department of the Government, but certainly the Government has been liberal in appropriating money in order that it may do this work, and I am proud to say this year it has seen fit to give some of this money to those who are trying their utmost to build up the Postal Service of this country. It is going into the homes of the men and the women who are working in the various branches of the department. It is going to help them to receive a substantial remuneration for the service rendered, and I trust that after that money has been appropriated others will be appropriated that will not only benefit them in a financial way, but will improve their working conditions; give them a workshop fit to work in, in a building owned by the Government, and not one that would not be permitted in any city or town or by any private corporation. That condition does prevail in this country in the Post Office Department. The sanitary conditions that these men are obliged to work under are deplorable and should be discontinued at once.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would not have taken my place to-day but for the fact that I have read in the report of the Postmaster General something that to me and others is a remarkable inconsistency. With other Members on the floor for the past four years, I have advocated the retention of a branch of the service that we believed, and I still believe, was of advantage to the people of this country. I refer to the pneumatic-tube service, which has the indorsement of all the commercial organizations of the country and the opposition of but one man—Burlison. Congress passed an act maintaining this service year after year, but the item failed to stay in the appropriation bill last session. We who advocated it were held up to ridicule and scorn because we were advocating something which we knew was benefiting the great commercial business of this country, but which, for reasons not yet properly explained, could not secure a fair word from the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General in his report to-day shows his inconsistency, shows how he has been inconsistent, for, after stating the reasons for the abolition of

the pneumatic-mail service, in the very next column he advocates the building beneath the congested district of the city of New York a tunnel or tube for carrying the mails. The appropriation for pneumatic-mail service was less than \$1,000,000 each year, yet here in this report, for the building of a tunnel, as he says, from the Pennsylvania Station to the New York Central Station, a distance of a mile, he wants an appropriation of \$1,500,000. When I read that report, Mr. Chairman, I asked men engaged in the contracting business, who have built subways and have built different underground systems of that city, if the figures were anywhere near what they should be. They ridiculed the figures. I want to call to the attention of the committee what the conditions as I know them are in that section of the city of New York. To build a tunnel from the Pennsylvania Station to the New York Central Station they will be obliged to go down 100 feet under the ground to get under the tunnels now in existence. Under Times Square there are three separate tunnels, one under the other, and the lower tunnel is more than 100 feet under the ground. Almost every inch of that ground from the Pennsylvania Station to the New York Central Station on Forty-second Street is through solid rock.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. TAGUE was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that it is necessary to reply to the remarks of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE], because the amount of money already realized from the abolition of the pneumatic-tube system is very great. In reference to the tunnel in New York which is proposed, it will be remembered by the House that under the law the leases for the tube should not be continued except upon the recommendation of the postal committee appointed under the act of Congress, which provided for inspection and recommendation as to continuance or rejection. The committee reported against all of the tubes except a portion of the city of New York that was so much congested, and they thought some system of that sort ought to remain there. The Congress, however, abolished the whole system. In pursuance of the law, in pursuance of justice to the city of New York and the congested conditions that exist in that particular part of the city, there has been a recommendation made for the construction, not of these inadequate tubes but of a tunnel that would be sufficient to carry all of the mail and be a source of profit itself to the Government. But that issue is all past, and it is not necessary for me to discuss it. There is nothing of that kind in the bill.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I most heartily concur with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER and Mr. TAGUE] pertaining to the subjects of the soldiers' allotments and the Post Office Pneumatic Tube Service.

In my opinion the delay in the payment of the allotments is inexcusable, and my experience is the same as that of which the gentlemen complain. I am aware that the great volume of business which is constantly handled by the War Risk Insurance Bureau is one of great magnitude and complexity, but since the signing of the armistice I see no reason why a speeding up of investigation and report, as well as payments long overdue, should not be made. A newly inaugurated policy of the bureau of demanding from widowed mothers and other dependent and indigent members of the soldiers' families who have received allotments inconsistent with some technical rule of the bureau is a most inequitable, unjust, and inhuman proceeding.

Recently I have had the distressing experience of interviews with widowed mothers, one of whom had three sons in the service, from whom had been demanded the return of allotment payment. There can be no question of the embarrassment of such an existing condition, and Congress should by all means remedy this unfortunate situation.

I can not forego this opportunity when the Post Office appropriation bill is under consideration to fail to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] in the indorsing of the proposal of the Postmaster General for a subservice system in the metropolitan city of New York, part of which I have the honor to represent. The Postmaster General advocates the construction of an underground tunnel from the Pennsylvania Station to the Grand Central Station. It is proposed that it be used for the distributing of the mails from the Southern and Western States to the Eastern and Northern ones. The proposed tunnel will in no way serve the city of New York in the distribution of its own mail. I am informed that the appropriation of a million and a half has been suggested for its construction. In my opinion it is uneconomic and impracticable.

Uneconomic for the reason that there are now 26 miles of pneumatic tubes connecting the Pennsylvania, Grand Central, and the Harlem district, which I represent, and its eastern and western stations with the City Hall station, which can be leased as formerly by the Government for a very reasonable price for the service performed. Since July last, when this service was abolished and the vehicular service was installed, the delivery delay has been increased to a remarkable degree. Under the tube system there was dispatched about every 10 minutes carriers which required about 18 minutes in passage for the mail to be carried from Harlem to the down-town stations. By the present auto delivery a period of two and a half hours is consumed in traveling the same area, and the time more frequently consumed is about three and a quarter hours.

It will readily be seen that the present delay in the delivery of the mails is regrettable and annoying. Telegrams from the New York Chamber of Commerce and the Merchants' Association of New York, calling attention to the abolishing of the pneumatic-tube service and expressing the hope that it will be reinstated is a substantial and intelligent expression of the desire of the business interests of the city of New York for the reoperating of the system. However, as the learned chairman of the committee [Mr. Moon] says, the present operation of the pneumatic-tube service is a closed question.

In conclusion I wish to state that I entertain no prejudice against the Postmaster General. My mind is open and not foreclosed as to his qualifications or his intentions. We must, in all fairness at least, say: That he now admits the existence of the serious traffic street congestion and the necessity for resorting to an underground mail transportation service. Such service, however, can not, in the opinion of experts, be constructed in the city of New York for the sum of a million and a half dollars by reason of the present subway railroad system. It would necessitate the sinking of the proposed tunnel to approximately 100 feet, almost an impossible engineering problem, and would be necessary to tunnel through bedrock.

I therefore submit for the consideration of the House the necessity of the underground service, which the Postmaster General now declares is essential. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown] 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have come this afternoon, in the midst of general debate on this great appropriation bill, to take a few minutes of your time to pay a tribute to the valor of some of Oklahoma's soldiers on the western front. [Applause.] I want to say to this House that I hope that the time will never come when it will be too busy and when the business of this House is too important to spare a few moments to pay some tribute to the heroes who have fought that we might still be here and have the right to speak. [Applause.] This war has demonstrated one thing beyond peradventure, and that is that the geographic location of the men has nothing to do with their fighting qualities. This war has demonstrated that the men from the East, the West, the North, and South have displayed great courage on the battle field side by side, and I shall take a few minutes of your time to talk about the soldiers from Oklahoma. They fought side by side with the soldiers from every State in the Union. I call your attention to the splendid record of the Thirty-sixth and Ninetieth Divisions, and I present some information that has come from across the sea. The Thirty-sixth Division, known as the Panther Division, was in action for 16 days. The record shows that the division met the crack division, known as the Kaiser's Favorites; we are told that in the first three hours of action their casualties amounted to 2,000 men. They went out upon the open, expecting the enemy to meet them in hand-to-hand fighting, but they were disappointed, because the enemy withdrew their men from the battle field east of Rheims and they had to face the machine-gun fire which caused so many casualties and losses. The Ninetieth Division, consisting of many soldiers from Oklahoma, fought for 74 days on the western front, and we are told that at 9.40 o'clock on the 11th day of November the Ninetieth was in action and under fire, and the One hundred and eightieth Brigade of that division, led by Lieut. Col. Teall, son-in-law of our distinguished and able Representative from New York [Mr. Snyder], at that time was under fire and in the lead. [Applause.] Gentlemen, we can never say too much of the bravery of those men. They have absolutely won for themselves great glory and renown on the battle field. I say to you that they have crowned their fathers and mothers with great glory that they brought such men into the world. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Clerk to read in my time the order of commendation that was written by Maj. Gen. Allen,

commending the Ninetieth Division, a true copy of which was sent by Col. Teall.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HEADQUARTERS NINETIETH DIVISION,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
France, November 14, 1918.

General Orders, No. 144.

1. Prior to beginning operations in this, the Meuse-Argonne, sector the commanding general published to the division on October 15, 1918, his estimate of it, reserving final decision as to where it should be classed until later. He no longer has any doubts or reluctance in claiming for the Ninetieth Division fighting qualities second to none. Every regiment has gained its objective in every operation in which it has participated, and the division has exceeded its allotment in the execution of every task assigned it.

2. Beginning October 31, the work of the division, including the taking of the strong position Freya Stelling, from Andevanne through Villers-devant-Dun to the Meuse River, against the determined resistance of two enemy shock divisions, Twenty-eighth and Twenty-seventh, has been simply superb. The crossing of the Meuse and the taking of the line Stenay-Baalon, including both towns, has been a continuation of the previous successful work of this division.

3. This division received two official commendations for its work in the St. Mihiel salient near the Moselle River, and to-day it has received the third of a series of three commendations, in which the Third Corps commander expresses his high appreciation of the gallant conduct, which he desires to make of permanent record. I make no mention of the general commendations given by the commander of the First Army and the commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces, in which this division was included.

4. The division commander has no adequate words to express his great satisfaction and delight with the fine military spirit of the division and his pride in its fighting value after 74 days (less an interval of 7 days) in the fighting lines. The Engineer, the sanitary troops, the Signal Battalion, and the trains have emulated the fighting impulses of the combatant troops. In spite of the severe losses and the terrific demands that these successes have exacted, the indomitable spirit and keenness to fight continue to characterize the division.

5. Every member of this gallant force has a right to be proud of the services he has rendered in the great cause of human liberty. Our country may count with assurance upon the execution with success of whatever duty it may intrust to the Ninetieth Division.

HENRY T. ALLEN, Major General.

A true copy.

E. H. HEALL, Lieutenant Colonel,
Adjutant, One hundred and eightieth Infantry Brigade.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when the casualty lists have all come in I know no more fitting tribute that this House could pay to the memory of those who gave up their all than to hold a memorial service out of respect to the soldiers of this country who died in France. Before I conclude I want to pay a word of tribute to the Indian soldiers of my country. The report shows that the One hundred and forty-second lost heavily in the fight. It was the hardest hit. "The Indians of the One hundred and forty-second started in easy, without much show of enthusiasm, but when they saw the blood they got excited and turned into savages again and turned on the Huns with such havoc that there was no withstanding them." This record, gentlemen, was made by many men who gave their lives for their country, and I hope the time will come when this House will hold a memorial service in their memory. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he desires to proceed further?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved half an hour for the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] to discuss the aeroplane service, but he had to go back to New York, and he requested that I should try to get him in on Monday. So, if the chairman of the committee could see in the kindness of his heart the way clear to move to rise now, I would promise that I would yield to Mr. LaGuardia Monday.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman has no further speeches, then?

Mr. STEENERSON. From no gentleman that is here.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I request that the clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] did not hear the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEENERSON. I requested that the gentleman from Tennessee move to rise.

Mr. MOON. I will say this about Mr. LaGuardia: If you want to give him time when we get to that section of the bill, we can be liberal with the time and let him speak. We ought to close general debate on this bill now and begin its reading before adjournment.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman agree with me to request 30 minutes for Mr. LaGuardia?

Mr. MOON. I, of course, do not object to Mr. LaGuardia speaking for 30 minutes at any time.

Mr. STEENERSON. Very well. There is no one else who desires time.

Mr. MOON. It will be under the paragraph of the bill. Of course, the House will have to give consent, but I shall make no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. I have no further time.

The CHAIRMAN. If no one desires to speak, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I understood from my colleague [Mr. STEENERSON] that Mr. LA GUARDIA desired 30 minutes to address the committee on the subject of aeroplanes. I personally consider that one of the most important addresses that this committee has ever listened to or ever will, and I think he made a very suitable request of the gentleman in charge of the bill to rise.

Mr. MOON. "The gentleman in charge of the bill" agreed that the gentleman from New York might have the 30 minutes when we came to the aeroplane proposition.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Well, there will not be anybody here now. I do not like to make the point of no quorum.

Mr. MOON. There is nobody here now.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I know it. The gentleman can move to rise right now and permit Mr. LA GUARDIA to have the time when we meet on Monday.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will it be agreeable to the chairman of the committee that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] may have 30 minutes immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday?

Mr. MOON. I do not care when the gentleman takes the 30 minutes. I wanted to start the reading of the bill by paragraphs. If he wants the 30 minutes at that time or any time during the discussion, I will have no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will prefer that request when we get into the House.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Why does the gentleman select Tuesday?

Mr. STAFFORD. Because this coming Monday is Unanimous Consent and Suspension Day.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Under the circumstances it seems that that might be a happy solution, but 30 minutes is not enough.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is all the time he requested.

Mr. STEENERSON. How much time have we left, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has 30 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Tennessee 37 minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Could not the gentleman from Tennessee add 10 minutes to the amount of time that my colleague has?

Mr. MOON. I will see to it when it comes up. I am generally pretty liberal about those things.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It is nothing but information in which, I think, every Member is interested.

Mr. MOON. I understand what he wants to talk about. I have talked with him about it, and I am sure it will be an interesting speech. We have no disposition to shut him off now, but the general debate ought to be closed now. He can address the committee under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. As I understand, the gentleman would make no objection to unanimous consent when we rise that Mr. LA GUARDIA have 45 minutes next Tuesday after the Journal is read to address the House on the subject of aeroplanes in the war?

Mr. MOON. No. That would go 10 minutes beyond the time he is entitled to if we had the speech now.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is entirely satisfactory. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For gas, electric power and light, and the repair of machinery, United States Post Office Department equipment shops building, \$4,500.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about the time that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] uses, I understand the motion of the gentleman is to get that time on Tuesday. It is possible that unanimous consent may be exhausted or that the House might agree that we proceed with this bill on Monday. If the gentleman desires to proceed on Monday or Tuesday he could do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. I prefer the unanimous-consent request on behalf of the gentleman from New York, that immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday he be allowed 45 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I understood the gentleman from New York would be here on Monday.

Mr. MOON. There should be no misunderstanding about it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It would be better for Tuesday. The Unanimous Consent Calendar has not been called for a long time and some of the bills might be considered important, and we ought to have a full day. The gentleman has arranged for Tuesday.

Mr. STEENERSON. There is no certainty about how much time will be used on Monday for unanimous-consent business.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee how far he is going to read to-night?

Mr. MOON. I am going to move to rise in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to clerks at division headquarters, 15, at \$1,800 each; 15, at \$1,600 each; 20, at \$1,400 each; 30, at \$1,200 each; 10, at \$1,000 each; and 10, at \$900 each; in all, \$134,000.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FOCHT, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. BACHARACH, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HAWLEY, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Joseph B. Doan (H. R. 10769), no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to prefer a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday, not to interfere with conference reports, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] be privileged to speak for 45 minutes on the subject of aviation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that next Tuesday, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] be permitted to speak, not to exceed 45 minutes, on the subject of aviation.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I reserve the right to object. Is it Mr. LA GUARDIA himself that wants that amount of time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair takes it for granted, inasmuch as the gentleman from Wisconsin is asking for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been given assurance by the gentlemen acquainted with the situation that the gentleman from New York does wish that amount of time.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman that he will have to boil down very materially the information he has in order to compress it within 45 minutes, but I am sure he will do it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Is it to be an account of his trip to Europe?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It is to cover his experience in aviation in the war.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Is it for or against air mail service?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not think it concerns the air mail service. I think it will cover his experience in aviation in the war.

Mr. RAGSDALE. He will give his experience in aviation over there?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] a few moments ago stated that when this bill came up for consideration under the five-minute rule there would be no objection to the gentleman from New York having 45 minutes under a motion to strike out the last word, so that that will give the gentleman from New York the time he desires.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not believe that at this session we should further continue the practice of granting consent for gentlemen to speak, independent of the business before the House, immediately upon the approval of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, as we did during the last session.

I hope the gentleman will not embarrass the situation by insisting upon his request. If my understanding is not correct, I shall not interpose any objection; but I will ask my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] if it was not agreed just a few moments ago that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] should have 45 minutes when this bill is considered under the five-minute rule—that is, that there will be no objection so far as the gentleman is concerned?

Mr. MOON. I agreed that so far as I was concerned there would be no objection of that kind and that the gentleman might have the time whenever he wanted it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Was not the conversation and the understanding that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] was to have this time immediately after the reading of the Journal?

Mr. MOON. I did not so understand; but I want to say that so far as I am concerned I do not object to his having it immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I thoroughly understand that; but the gentleman will recall that while he did not use the language, it was the language that was used and the language that was in the Member's mind when the request was submitted.

Mr. STAFFORD. I distinctly said that I would prefer a request that immediately after the reading of the Journal the gentleman from New York might have 45 minutes. That was before the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Garrett] came into the Chamber.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; the gentleman from Tennessee was in the Chamber all the time and heard the agreement that was made.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I will say to the gentleman that the record shows conclusively, without any question, that the understanding was that I was to prefer the request when the committee got into the House, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] should have 45 minutes immediately after the reading of the Journal. To that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] assented.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman from Wisconsin made that statement, and I did not object, and I want to state now that I do not object to that, or to his having 45 minutes at any other time. The fact is that it will be 45 minutes out of the time for considering this bill, and it does not matter when it comes out.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Garrett] that while his viewpoint respecting many requests of this kind is undoubtedly sound, yet this is a very extraordinary case. A Member of this body, one of the first to leave it to go to war, saw a great deal of extraordinarily interesting experience. Now, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] has just stated, it does not matter whether the 45 minutes are used immediately after the reading of the Journal or under the five-minute rule. It is so much time and only so much time. Now, it will be a distinct advantage to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] and to the Members, I think, to have this immediately after the reading of the Journal. It will be advertised to come off at that time, there will undoubtedly be a full attendance in the House, and it will happen early in the day. If it is under the five-minute rule, everybody knows that the attendance is more or less uncertain, and the circumstances are certainly not proper. I should think the gentleman would vastly rather have this disposed of in the manner suggested than to have it disposed of by taking 45 minutes under the five-minute rule.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that it was my understanding that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] wanted to speak on the bill about aviation, and that consequently it would be relevant to the discussion of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I say to the gentleman that while there is good ground, as everyone must admit, for the position that he takes, that we should not in this short session grant consent to Members to speak at certain appointed times, yet in this instance there were 35 minutes of general debate remaining on the Republican side and 37 minutes of general debate remaining on the Democratic side. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Steener] was anxious to yield the 35 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia]. He was here early in the afternoon, but had to leave to go back to New York. The gentleman from Minnesota would have yielded the 35 minutes remaining on this side and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] would have yielded 10 minutes more on his side, but the gentleman from Tennessee was anxious to have the reading of the bill begun so that there would be no further claims for time under general debate, and we arrived at a tentative agreement that on Tuesday, immediately after the reading of the Journal—and in effect using the time remaining in general debate—the

gentleman from New York would be accorded 45 minutes, 35 of the time of the gentleman from Minnesota and 10 minutes of the time of the gentleman from Tennessee. That was the understanding, to which there was no dissent at the time it was made.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand that that will be exactly what will occur when the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] will move to strike out the last word and will then speak for 45 minutes. That will give the gentleman from New York his time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman have any objection to this request, that when we next go into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] may have 45 minutes in which to discuss aviation?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I would have no objection. I will refer that to my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. Moon].

To make it perfectly clear, I want to say that there is nothing personal to our colleague, Mr. LaGuardia, in my attitude about this. But I do not think that during this short session we should arrange for speeches independent of the bills under consideration. We have done that by unanimous consent all during the past session. I do not think we should do it during this session. I do not want, of course, to interfere with the speaking of the gentleman from New York, but I do want it to be upon and under the time agreed upon for consideration of the bills.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is under the time for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If we do not do this we will have many embarrassments arise.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, who has the floor, and what is the subject matter?

The SPEAKER. Nobody has the floor.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to exactly acquiesce in the statement of the Speaker. The gentleman from Wisconsin preferred a request for unanimous consent and I reserved the right to object.

The SPEAKER. That was so long ago that the Chair forgot it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. That satisfies my purpose, and I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does not the gentleman think, with his long experience in parliamentary matters, that it is better for a gentleman if he wishes to speak about a post-office matter to discuss it on the Post Office bill, and if he wishes to discuss aviation, to do it on the bill for aviation?

Mr. STAFFORD. It has been the practice for years in the course of general debate for a Member to speak on any subject whatever.

Mr. WINGO. That was before the war, but this is a period of readjustment. Does not the gentleman think that we should readjust parliamentary matters and get out of some of the old ruts?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Minnesota can leave this question to the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that as soon as the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union takes up for further consideration under the five-minute rule the Post Office appropriation bill, after the reading of the first section, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] shall have permission to address the House for a period not exceeding 45 minutes on the subject of aviation.

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, what the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] wants and what he has talked to me about and to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Steener] about and to Mr. Moon about, is that there is an item in the bill providing for aviation, and there is an appropriation for that purpose, and he wants to talk upon that subject when that item is reached. That is what he stated he wanted and what he said and what we agreed with him about. If he will wait until this item is reached, there will be no trouble about the time and no need of making any special arrangement about it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. With all due deference to the information which I am confident that my colleague has, while I am sure the gentleman from New York wants to address himself somewhat to that proposition, I know that he wants to address himself at some length to the subject of aviation in its largest sense. That is what I want to hear him upon and the membership of the House wants to hear him.

Mr. MADDEN. He can do that when the item in regard to aviation is up.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman will permit, nobody knows when that moment will arrive—neither the gentleman from New York nor anyone else. I think it is of sufficient importance that the membership wants to be here, and if it is fixed at that time they will be here. In addition to that, if the time is fixed now, the gentleman from New York will know that he will have it, and if we leave it open we can not tell who might object to it after the first five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not see why the gentleman from New York felt it necessary to go outside of the committee, with whom he was making an arrangement, to get time and have an understanding with a gentleman who is not on the committee. I give you my word that the understanding I had with him was that I would help him get the time when the item was reached.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I beg to assure the gentleman that I have no understanding of any kind with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA]. I would have no authority in this matter of any kind except to make this request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, December 15, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, transmitting a copy of the report of the Chief of the Division of Publications of this department for the fiscal year 1918, which contains a detailed statement of publications received and the number distributed by this department during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1587); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with report of J. W. Sackett, assistant engineer in charge, with map dated March 20, 1918, on a preliminary examination of Miami Harbor (Biscayne Bay), Fla. (H. Doc. No. 1588); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, transmitting a statement of money received from the sale of waste paper from December 1, 1917, to December 1, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1589); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13366) permitting any person who has served in the Army in the present war to retain his uniform and personal equipment, and to wear the same under certain conditions, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 863), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13392) to permanently transfer the United States Coast Guard from the Treasury Department to the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13393) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Missouri River between the States of Nebraska and Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 13394) to extend the time for the completion of the dam across the Savannah River by authority granted to Twin City Power Co. by an act approved February 29, 1908, as amended by act approved March 1, 1916; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUSTED: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) declaratory of the judgment of Congress respecting foreign alliances and the freedom of the seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 13395) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Hallowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13396) for the relief of Thomas Casey, alias Clancy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 13397) granting an increase of pension to Wesley G. McPherson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 13398) for the relief of Henry Schulz as branch postmaster at his drug store, at southeast corner of Vandeventer and Laclede Avenues, city of St. Louis, Mo., for war-tax stamps, war-savings stamps, postage stamps, cash, and money orders stolen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 13399) granting a pension to William Thornton Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 13400) granting to certain claimants a preference right to purchase certain lands in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National Association of Credit Men, the Associated Silver Co., the Chicago Association of Credit Men, and the Elting Co., of Chicago, for the passage of the revenue bill before the end of the year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Petition of Kentucky Tobacco Growers' Association, for the appointment of a commission to fix the price on tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution adopted by New Korea Association, relating to Korea's grievances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Resolution of the State convention of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, at Lewiston, Me., on Irish emancipation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

SUNDAY, December 15, 1918.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are called together in Thy providence that we may accord a national honor to the memory of a distinguished member of this body. We pause in the midst of the pressing duties of these fateful days, and in the golden moments of the holy Sabbath we perform this sacred duty.

It is our obligation to inscribe upon the unperishable honor roll of our departed statesmen the name of the Senator from South Carolina. Thou didst endow him with many qualities of heart and mind that made him a power in our national councils. Passionate in his advocacy of the rights of all men, devoted in his friendships, consistent with the principles which he avowed in his public life.

By his far-sighted statesmanship, by his high sense of honor, by his strong defense of his political creed, he has made his name safe in the annals of American history.

We would not seek to assess the value of such a career. His record is with Thee, to whom we must all turn at last to give an account of our stewardship.

We pray that to-day as we recall his service to his country we may feel the ever-increasing responsibility of representing great sovereign States in this Senate. As we stand in this place of world-wide influence and power we seek the endowment of the spirit of righteousness to direct and control our lives according to the divine will.

We serve our fellowmen in the name and for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore [Mr. SAULSBURY] assumed the chair.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR TILLMAN.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions and ask for their adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolutions.